

Vol. XXIX.

JANUARY, 1952.

No. 1.

THE AUSTRALASIAN Catholic Record

FOR CLERGY
AND RELIGIOUS



*The Official Organ for communications issued by the
Apostolic Delegate to Australasia.*

Announcements

MSS., queries and books for review, should be addressed to the Editor, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

Queries relating to S. Scripture, Moral Theology, Canon Law, Liturgy, or any subject of professional interest, are cordially invited. Name and address, even if not intended for publication, must accompany all Queries.

Notice of change of address, and correspondence about missing and back numbers, should be addressed to the Manager, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

SUBSCRIPTIONS: *Yearly, in advance, 15/-.*

Remittances should be sent to the Manager or the Diocesan Collector, either by postal order or cheque.

The clergy of each diocese are invited to appoint one of their number to collect and forward their annual subscriptions.

The following priests are acting as collectors and representatives for the *Australasian Catholic Record* in their respective dioceses:—

Archdiocese of Sydney—*A.C.R.* Staff.

Archdiocese of Perth—Rt. Rev. J. T. McMahon, M.A., Ph.D., South Perth, W.A.

Archdiocese of Wellington—Rev. J. L. Dunn, Paraparauma, N.Z.

Archdiocese of Adelaide—Rev. D. O'Connell, Murray Bridge, S.A.

Archdiocese of Brisbane—Rev. V. Carroll, Banyo, Q.

Archdiocese of Hobart—Rev. J. Wallis, Hobart, Tas.

Archdiocese of Canberra and Goulburn—Rev. J. Blakeney, P.P., Cobargo, N.S.W.

Diocese of Armidale—Rev. J. Healy, Armidale, N.S.W.

Diocese of Auckland—Rt. Rev. L. Buxton, D.C.L., M.A., Hamilton, N.Z.

Diocese of Ballarat—Very Rev. J. H. Gleeson, St. Arnaud, Vic.

Diocese of Bathurst—V. Rev. M. J. Dunne, B.A., Adm. Bathurst, N.S.W.

Diocese of Cairns—Rev. E. C. Clifford, O.S.A., Tully, Q.

Diocese of Christchurch—V. Rev. T. Liddy, Adm., Christchurch, N.Z.

Diocese of Darwin—Rev. W. Henschke, M.S.C., Darwin, N.T.

Diocese of Dunedin—Rev. A. Loughnan, Dunedin, N.Z.

Diocese of Geraldton—Rt. Rev. Bryan Gallagher, Ph.D., Three Springs, W.A.

Diocese of Lismore—V. Rev. T. Morris, P.P., Smithtown, N.S.W.

Diocese of Maitland—Rev. T. Cronin, Sandgate, N.S.W.

Diocese of Port Augusta—Very Rev. W. P. Kain, Pekina, S.A.

Diocese of Rockhampton—V. Rev. P. J. Walsh, D.D., Adm., Rockhampton, Q.

Diocese of Sale—V. Rev. J. Fitzpatrick, Leongatha, Vic.

Diocese of Sandhurst—Rev. J. Hussey, Yarrawonga, Vic.

Diocese of Toowoomba—Rev. M. Mahon, Adm., Warwick, Q.

Diocese of Townsville—Very Rev. K. J. H. Kelly, D.D., Ayr, Q.

Diocese of Wagga—V. Rev. J. Larkins, P.P., Junee, N.S.W.

Diocese of Wilcannia-Forbes—Very Rev. Dean J. Sexton, V.F., Nyngan, N.S.W.

Editor:
V. Rev. Mgr. T. VEECH.

Manager: REV. F. A. MECHAM,
St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

The Australasian Catholic Record

A Quarterly Publication under Ecclesiastical Sanction

"Pro Ecclesia Dei." St. Augustine.

Contents:

OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS,	
Rev. William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S.	1
General Statutes of Nuns—Instruction of S.C. of Religious on realization of the constitution <i>Sponsa Christi</i> .	
PRIESTLY PERFECTION,	
Right Rev. Mgr. James Madden, D.D.	15
BISHOP WILLSON, X,	
Right Rev. Mgr. John H. Cullen, V.G.	20
DOGMATIC THEOLOGY	28
Rev. Thomas Muldoon, D.D.	
The Theology of the Mass, VI.	
MORAL THEOLOGY, Right Rev. Mgr. James Madden, D.D.	43
Annual Communion and absolution from reserved cases—Lawfulness of consent of parent to marriage of minor—Enclosure of nuns—Questions concerning Extreme Unction.	
CANON LAW . .	55
Right Rev. Mgr. James Carroll, P.P., D.C.L.	
Marriage of former Anglican Religious—Mixed Marriage contracted before witnesses only—Convent chaplain as ordinary confessor—Non-Catholic's marriage contracted without valid civil form.	
LITURGY	60
Rev. Patrick Murphy, D.D.	
Pronunciation of Blessed in Divine Praises—Necessity of crucifix on the altar—Public Stations of the Cross—The punctuation of the Preface of the Mass.	
HOMILETICS	64
Rev. Patrick Murphy, D.D.	
Union with Christ.	
NOTES	68
Therese Neumann of Konnersreuth.	
BOOK REVIEWS	77
<i>De Sanctissima Trinitate</i> (Ceuppens); <i>Patrology</i> , Vol. 1 (Quasten); <i>Against the Academics</i> (St. Augustine, Trans. O'Meara); <i>The Breaking of Bread</i> (Coventry); <i>The Saints in Pictures</i> (Ward); <i>Apologetics for the Pulpit</i> (Roche); <i>In the Service of Youth</i> (Hoesl); <i>Four Years' Struggles of the Church in Hungary</i> (Card. Mindszenty); <i>St. Peter Damian: His Teaching on Spiritual Life</i> (Blum); <i>The Nazarine</i> (Luddy); <i>Storm of Glory</i> (Beevers); <i>Faith Seeks Understanding</i> (Coventry); <i>Collected Letters of St. Therese of Lisieux</i> (Ed. Combes); <i>The Sin of Adam in the Writings of St. Thomas Aquinas</i> (Fitzpatrick) [p. 42]; <i>The Case of Therese Neumann</i> (Graef) [p. 68].	

Nihil Obstat :

RICHARDUS COLLENDER

CENSOR DEPUTATUS.

Imprimatur :

✠ N.T. CARD. GILROY,

ARCHIEP. SYDNEYENSIS.

1a die, Januarii, 1952.

Official Documents

GENERAL STATUTES OF NUNS.

Art. I.

1. The name of Nuns (*Moniales*) throughout this Constitution is taken to mean, (as in Canon Law—c. 488, 7^o), not only Religious Women of solemn vows, but also those Religious who have professed simple vows, perpetual or temporary, in monasteries where solemn vows are actually taken or according to the institute should be taken—unless the context or the nature of things makes another meaning clear.

2. The legal use of the name *Nuns* (c. 488, 7^o) and the application of the law of Nuns is not excluded by 1) *simple profession* legitimately made in Monasteries (§1); 2) nor by *minor papal enclosure* prescribed or duly allowed; 3) nor by *the exercise of works of apostolate*, when this is joined to the contemplative life, either by a statute approved, and confirmed by the Holy See for some Orders, or by legitimate prescription or concession of the the Holy See for some Monasteries.

3. This Apostolic Constitution does not juridically regard: Religious Congregations (c. 488, 2^o) and the Sisters belonging to them (c. 488, 7^o), who only take simple vows by reason of their institute; neither does it regard Societies of women living in common, like Religious, and the members of such Societies.

Art. II.

1. The special kind of monastic religious life, which Nuns must faithfully cultivate, under a rigid discipline of rule, and for which they are destined by the Church, is the canonical contemplative life.

2. By canonical contemplative life is understood not that internal and theological life to which all souls in Religion and even in the world are invited, and which individuals can live anywhere; but that external profession of religious discipline which, by reason of enclosure, or by reason of exercises of piety, prayer and mortification, or by reason of the works which the Nuns must do, is so directed to interior contemplation that the whole life and the whole activity of the Religious can be easily imbued with the pursuit of contemplation and ought to be so imbued effectively.

3. If canonical contemplative life under a rigid discipline of rule cannot be habitually maintained, the monastic character is to be refused, and, if already possessed, it is not to be retained.

Art. III.

1. Solemn religious vows taken by all the members of the Monastery or by at least one class of them constitute the chief mark whereby Monasteries of women are numbered legally not among religious Congregations but amongst regular Orders (c. 488, 2^o). All Religious women who have made profession in those Monasteries are called by the appellation of Regulars in law, according to c. 490, and bear the special name not of Sisters but of Nuns (c. 488, 7^o).

2. All Monasteries, in which only simple vows are taken, can on request obtain the restoration of solemn vows. Furthermore, unless really grave reasons counsel otherwise, they *ought* to return to solemn vows.

3. The ancient solemn formulae of the consecration of Virgins, which is found in the Roman Pontifical, is reserved to Nuns.

Art. IV.

1. The more strict enclosure of Nuns, which is called papal—with the proviso that the special characteristics that are, as it were, natural to a Monastery must always remain firm for all Monasteries—is henceforth to be distinguished into two kinds: *major* and *minor*.

2. 1^o. Major papal enclosure, that, namely, which is described in the Code (cc. 600-602) is entirely confirmed by this Constitution. The Sacred Congregation of Religious, shall, by Our Authority, declare on what grounds a dispensation from major enclosure can be granted. The nature of the enclosure shall be safeguarded, while it is more suitably adapted to the conditions of our time.

2^o. Major papal enclosure (with due regard to § 3, 3^o) must be the rule and law of all Monasteries that profess the contemplative life only.

3. 1^o. Minor papal enclosure shall retain those elements of the ancient enclosure of Nuns, and shall be safeguarded with those sanctions which are expressly defined as necessary in Instructions of the Holy See—that is to say, necessary for the preservation and safeguarding of its real character.

2^o. To this minor enclosure are subject Monasteries of Nuns of solemn vows which, either by institute or by lawful concession, undertake ministrations for outsiders to such an extent that many Religious and a notable part of the house are habitually engaged in those ministrations.

3^o. Likewise, the regulations of this enclosure at least is for all

Monasteries—all and each—which, although purely contemplative, have only simple vows.

4. 1^o. Papal enclosure, major or minor, is to be regarded as a necessary condition not only that solemn vows can be taken (§ 2), but also that those Monasteries in which simple vows are taken (§ 3) be regarded hereafter as true Monasteries of Nuns, according to c. 488, 7^o.

2^o. If the rules of papal enclosure, minor at least, cannot be habitually observed, the solemn vows, which have been in use, must cease.

5. 1^o. Minor papal enclosure, in all those chief notes by which it is distinguished from the enclosure of Congregations or of Orders of men is to be observed in places where Nuns do not take solemn vows.

2^o. If it appears with certainty that in some Monastery minor enclosure (at least) cannot be habitually observed, that Monastery must be changed into a house either of a Congregation or of a Society.

Art. V.

1. It is Nuns alone amongst women consecrated to God that the Church deposes to that public prayer, which in her name is offered to God either in choir (c. 610, § 1) or privately (c. 610, § 3); the Church, by their rule and according to their Constitutions, makes it a grave obligation for them to offer this prayer of the canonical hours each day.

2. All Monasteries of Nuns and the Nuns, all and each, who have made solemn or simple vows are bound everywhere to recite the divine office in choir according to c. 610, § 1, and their Constitutions.

3. According to c. 610, § 3, Nuns who were absent from choir, if they have not taken solemn vows, are not strictly bound to the private recital of the Hours, unless the Constitutions expressly prescribe otherwise (c. 578, 2^o); it is, however, not only the mind of the Church, as said above, that solemn vows of Nuns be restored everywhere, but also, if for a time they cannot be restored, that Nuns, who have taken perpetual simple vows instead of solemn, faithfully carry out the obligation of the divine office.

4. In all Monasteries a conventual Mass corresponding to the office of the day, according to the rubrics, must as far as possible be celebrated (c. 610, § 2).

Art. VI.

1. 1^o. Monasteries of Nuns, different from other religious houses of women, according to the Code and in its terms, are independent (c. 488, 8^o).

2^o. The Superioresses of Monasteries of Nuns are in law Major

Superiors, and enjoy all faculties that belong to Major Superiors (c. 488, 8^o), unless in the context or by the nature of things some faculties belong to men only (c. 490).

2. 1^o. The ambit of the condition of *independence* or of autonomy, as it is called, in the case of Monasteries of Nuns is defined by common law and special law.

2^o. Neither, from this Constitution nor from the Federations of Monasteries, permitted by the Constitution and introduced by its authority (art. VII), is any derogation made from the juridical guardianship which the law grants either to the local Ordinaries or to regular Superiors in regard to single Monasteries.

3^o. The juridical relations of Monasteries with the local Ordinaries or with regular Superiors shall continue to be ruled by common law and special law.

3. By this Constitution it is not at all defined, whether individual Monasteries are subject to the power of the local Ordinary or whether, within the limits of law, they are exempt from it and subject to a regular Superior.

Art. VII.

1. Monasteries of Nuns are not only autonomous (c. 488, 8^o) but also juridically distinct and mutually independent, united and bound by no other bonds than those spiritual and moral, although duly subject to the same first Order or Religion.

2. 1^o. The mutual liberty of Monasteries—which is a matter of fact rather than an imposition of law—is in no way hindered by the constitution of Federations . . . such Federations should *not* be regarded as prohibited by law or as less in harmony with the nature and purpose of the religious life of Nuns.

2^o. Federations of Monasteries, though not commended by any general rule, are, nevertheless, greatly recommended by the Apostolic See, not only to preclude the evils and inconveniences which can arise from full separation, but also in view of promoting regular observance and the contemplative life.

3. The setting up of any form of Federation of Monasteries of Nuns or of Confederations of Federations is reserved to the Apostolic See.

4. Every Federation or Confederation must necessarily be ordered and ruled by its own laws approved by the Holy See.

5. 1^o. Paragraphs 2 and 3 of Art. VI being safeguarded, as well as

the chief character of autonomy defined above (§ 1), nothing discountenances, in the making of Federations, the introduction of equitable conditions and intermissions of this autonomy. Such may appear necessary and useful and have precedents in the example of some monastic Congregations and Orders, either of Canons or of Monks.

2^o. Forms of Federation, however, which seem to be contrary to the aforesaid autonomy (§ 1) and come close to the character of a central government, are specially reserved to the Holy See, and may not be made without its express concession.

6. Federations of Monasteries, in regard to the source from which they come and the Authority whereon they depend and whereby they are governed, are of papal right (*iuris pontificii*), according to Canon Law.

7. The Holy See can, according as the case requires, exercise vigilance and authority through some religious Assistant, whose office it shall be not only to represent the Holy See, but also to foster the maintenance of the genuine spirit of the Order and help Superioresses both by act and advice in the right and prudent government of the Federation.

8. 1^o. The Statutes of a Federation must confirm not only to the norms worked out by the S. Congregation of Religious, with Our Authority, but also to the nature, laws, spirit and traditions, either astatic or disciplinary or juridical and apostolic, of the particular Order.

2^o. The chief end of the Federations of Monasteries is mutual help, not only in fostering the religious spirit and regular monastic discipline, but also economic advantage.

3^o. Should the case require, special norms should be given in approving the statutes—norms to moderate the power and moral obligation of mutual exchange of Nuns, which are considered necessary in view of governing the Monasteries, forming Novices in a common novitiate to be erected for all or for several Monasteries, also for the provisions required to meet other moral or material needs of the Monasteries or of the Nuns.

Art. VIII.

1. Monastic work, to which even Nuns of contemplative life should give themselves, must be reasonably in keeping with the Rule, Constitutions, and traditions of each Order.

2. Work ought to be so ordered, that together with other ways approved by the Church (cc. 547-551, 582) and with the subsidies

furnished by Divine Providence, it may make the sustentation of the Nuns sure and adequate.

3. 1^o. Local Ordinaries, regular Superiors and Superioresses of Monasteries and Federations are bound to use all diligence that necessary, adequate and useful work is never wanting to the Nuns.

2^o. Nuns are bound in conscience not only honestly and in the sweat of their brow to earn the bread on which they live, as the Apostle admonishes (2 Thess. 3: 10), but also to make themselves, as the times require, more and more skilful every day in regard to various kinds of work.

Art. IX.

All Nuns, if they are to be faithful to their divine apostolic vocation, shall take care to use the general instruments of monastic apostolate, while they observe the following, besides:

1. Nuns who have definite works of special apostolate, set before them in their Constitutions or lawful directions, must give and consecrate themselves faithfully to these in accordance with the Constitutions or Statutes.

2. Nuns who profess a purely contemplative life:

1^o. If in their traditions they have or shall have received some special form of external apostolate, let them adapt it to present necessities faithfully retaining it with due regard to their contemplative life. If they have lost it, let them diligently restore it. If some doubt remains about the adaptation of the form of apostolate, let them consult the Holy See;

2^o. If, on the other hand, the purely contemplative life was not heretofore joined in any perpetual and constant way to external apostolate—neither the Constitutions nor tradition establishing such a union of contemplative and active life—in this case, the Nuns can only for a limited time and in the face of need, be occupied in those singular forms of apostolate, especially in personal forms, from charity at least. The compatibility of these works with the contemplative life, as observed in the Order, shall be judged according to criteria fixed by the Holy See.

*

*

*

*

Given at Rome, from St. Peter's, the twenty-first day of November, sacred to the Presentation of the B.V.M., in the Jubilee Year 1950, the 12th of Our Pontificate.

PIUS XII POPE.

SACRED CONGREGATION OF RELIGIOUS.

Instruction

on the practical realization of the Constitution "Sponsa Christi".

[I-III. These paragraphs outline the task of the S. Congregation. The Instruction proper begins with paragraph IV.]

I.

On the enclosure of Nuns, Major and Minor.

IV. The Constitution "*Sponsa Christi*" (Art. IV) prescribes for all Nuns a special enclosure differing from the episcopal enclosure of Congregations (c. 604) and called papal by a general norm of law, just like the regular enclosure of men. As a matter of fact, it is ruled by more severe regulations than the papal enclosure of men, in many respects, notably in regard to the entrance of externals within the limits of the enclosure, and in regard to the passing of those limits by the Nuns.

V. The papal enclosure of Nuns shall henceforth be twofold: *major*, which is reserved for Monasteries in which, even with a diminished number of nuns, solemn vows are taken and a purely contemplative life is lived; and *minor*, which, by rule, is applied to Monasteries in which a life not purely contemplative is cultivated, or in which the Nuns take only simple vows.

I. *Major Papal Enclosure.*

VI. Major papal enclosure is that set forth in the Code (cc. 600, 602). It was accurately defined in an Instruction "*Nuper edito*" of this S. Congregation, issued with the approval of Pius XI of happy memory, on February 6, 1924. This enclosure is fully confirmed in the Constitution "*Sponsa Christi*," with the declarations to follow—which declarations the Constitution leaves to the S. Congregation to make (Art. IV, § 2, 1^o), so that its observance may be prudently adjusted to the needs of the times and to circumstances of place.

VII. Nuns bound by papal enclosure, once they are professed, both by force of their profession and by ecclesiastical law, contract a grave obligation:

1^o. Always to remain within the limits of the Monastery, which are marked as the definite lines of enclosure, so that it is not lawful for them to go outside of these, even for a moment, under any pretext or colour, without a special indult of the Holy See, excepting only the cases expressed in the Canons and Instructions of the Holy See, or

contemplated in the Constitutions or Statutes approved by the Holy See;

2^o. To admit no one into the parts of the Monastery laid under enclosure—no one of any class, condition, sex or age, even for a moment, without a special indult of the Holy See, excepting persons and cases expressed in the Canons, in the Instructions of the Holy See, and in the Constitutions or Statutes approved by the Holy See.

VIII. 1^o. Indults and dispensations for going outside major enclosure after profession (VII, 1^o), or going inside it or admitting others (16, 2^o) is reserved to the Holy See alone, and can only be granted by the Holy See, or in its name and by its delegation.

2^o. The reasons for obtaining dispensation must be of proportionate gravity in view of the circumstances of the cases or of the times—these being pondered with due attention also to the practice and style of the Curia.

IX. 1^o. The faculty to dispense can be given *ab homine* either for a definite time for all the cases occurring within that time, or for a certain number of cases. Nothing, however, stands in the way of some concessions being made habitually, in particular law legitimately approved, for instance, in the Constitutions, in the statutes of Federations and in similar documents.

2^o. Indults and dispensations, whether *ab homine* or *a iure*, general or particular, must define, in keeping with the Instructions of the Holy See and the practice and style of the Curia, the conditions and cautions to which the dispensation is subjected.

X. The penalties against those who violate the laws of enclosure remain firm, as contained in the Code (c. 2342, nn. 1, 3).

II. *Minor Papal Enclosure.*

XI. 1^o. *Minor* papal enclosure leaves intact the fundamental rules of the enclosure of Nuns, inasmuch as this differs from the enclosure of Congregations (c. 604) and from the enclosure of Orders of men (cc. 598, 599);

2^o. It must make sure and accessible to all the observance and custody of solemn chastity;

3^o. It must protect and efficaciously foster the contemplative life of the Monastery.

4^o. The Ministeries, which the Church entrusts to these Monasteries, are, under this minor papal enclosure, to be so adapted to the

contemplative life, that the contemplative life is entirely safeguarded and the ministries are duly and fruitfully exercised.

5^o. In Monasteries which attend to approved works, the prescription of canon 599, § 1, for the enclosure of Regular men (which is even applied to the enclosure of Congregations by Canon 604, § 2) is to be rigidly and faithfully observed. There must be evident and perfect separation between the buildings or parts of buildings destined for the living quarters of the Nuns and the exercises of the monastic life, on the one hand, and the buildings or parts set aside for works, on the other hand.

XII. Minor papal enclosure comprises:

1^o. A grave prohibition of admitting within the parts of the house destined for the Community of Nuns and by law subjected to enclosure (c. 597) any persons outsiders to the Community, whatever their class, condition, sex, or age (c. 600);

2^o. A prohibition, also grave, for Nuns, after profession, against going outside the limits of the Monastery, in the same way as Nuns subject to major enclosure (n. VII—IX).

XIII. 1^o. Egress of Nuns from the parts reserved to the Community to other places within the limits of the Monastery and destined to works of the apostolate is allowed them only because of the apostolate, with permission of the Superioress and under the cautions which according to the Constitutions and the prescriptions of the Holy See are fixed for the exercise of the apostolate in any way whatever.

2^o. Dispensations from the ruling of n. XII, 2^o, if such, on account of the apostolate, are necessary, can be given only to Nuns and other members who are legitimately assigned to ministries. In regard to this a grave obligation rests on the consciences of Superioresses, Ordinaries, and Superiors, to whom the safeguarding of the enclosure is committed (c. 603).

XIV. The entrance of externals to the places of Monasteries destined for works is regulated by these norms:

1^o. Habitual entrance is allowed to pupils or others, in whose favour the ministries are exercised, and to women only who, by reason and occasion of the ministries, must necessarily have contact with them;

2^o. The exceptions which must of necessity be admitted, for instance, those imposed by civil laws, in view of inspections, examinations or other such—which exceptions are to be defined in a general or habitual declaration by the local Ordinary;

3°. Other exceptions, which sometimes, in single cases, may seem really necessary, are reserved to express concessions of the Ordinary, and he in conscience must impose prudent cautions.

XV. 1°. Nuns unlawfully leaving the enclosure of the Monastery incur *ipso facto* excommunication reserved simply to the Holy See according to canon 2342, 3°, or by express concession, to the local Ordinary.

2°. Nuns unlawfully leaving the parts of the Monastery reserved to the Community and going to other places within the enclosure are to be punished by the Superioress or by the local Ordinary according to the gravity of their fault.

3°. Those unlawfully entering or introducing or admitting them into the parts of the Monastery reserved to the Community incur excommunication simply reserved to the Holy See.

4°. Those unlawfully entering or introducing, or admitting them to the places of the Monastery outside the parts destined for the Community by the local Ordinary of the place, where the Monastery is, are to be severely punished according to the gravity of their fault.

XVI. Dispensations from minor papal enclosure are regularly, excepting the cases admitted in law, reserved to the Holy See.

Faculties more or less wide, as circumstances seem to require, either *ab homine* or in the Constitutions and Statutes, can be delegated to the Ordinaries.

II.

On Federations of Monasteries of Nuns.

XVII. Federations of Monasteries of Nuns, in accordance with the Constitution "Sponsa Christi" (Art VII, § 2, 2°), are greatly recommended for two chief reasons. They help to the avoidance of losses, which more heavily and more easily come to Monasteries quite independent and are considerably avoidable through the efficacious strength of union; they are conducive to the strengthening of spiritual and temporal good things.

Although, regularly, Federations are not imposed (Art. VII, § 2, 2) the reasons, however, because of which they are recommended, may be so urgent, that, everything being weighed, they may, in particular cases, be deemed necessary by the S. Congregation.

XVIII. Federations of Monasteries should not be excluded, because the Monasteries that intend to make them, are, each singly, sub-

ject to Regular Superiors. In the *Statutes of Federation* account ought to be taken of this common subjection.

XIX. When from the mind of Founder or from any other super-venient reason some quasi-beginning of union or federation of Monasteries of the same order or institute exists, the Federation is to be so made, that the already received or sketched plan is respected.

XX. The Federation of Monasteries in no way affects directly the relation of the single Monasteries to the local Ordinaries or Regular Superiors, already in force by common or particular law. Hence, unless there is express and lawful derogation from this rule, the power of Ordinaries is neither increased, nor decreased, nor modified by Federation.

XXI. In the Statutes of Federation some things regarding Federation can be granted to Ordinaries or Regular Superiors, which regularly would not be theirs, while in general their rights on the single Monasteries remain intact.

XXII. The chief ends and advantages of Unions and Federations are:

1^o. The faculty, juridically recognised, and the duty canonically sanctioned of fraternal assistance, both in the preservation of regular observance, its defence and its increase, and in economic communications and other such mutual relations;

2^o. The erection of common novitiates for all or many monasteries, in which, either through the want of persons necessary for the offices of direction, or through other moral, economic, local circumstances, that is to say, in each Monastery singly, a solid, practical, spiritual instruction in discipline, technical matters and cultural things cannot be given;

3^o. The moral faculty and obligation, defined by certain norms, undertaken by federated Monasteries of asking and giving reciprocally Nuns, which may be necessary for government and formation;

4^o. The possibility and liberty of temporary mutual, communication or cession of subjects, and even of destination on account of infirmity or of some other moral or material necessity.

XXIII. The characteristics and notes of Federations, which, taken complexively, are essential, will be the following:

1^o. Federations of Nuns, both from the *source* of their origin and the *authority* on which they directly depend are of papal right (*iuris pontificii*) (c. 488, §3). Hence it belongs and is reserved to the Holy

See to erect them, to approve their Statutes, to ascribe Monasteries to a Federation, or separate them therefrom.

Safeguarding, in regard to single Monasteries, all that the Code grants to Ordinaries, Federations are subject to the Holy See in all those things, unless something is lawfully and expressly excepted, in which Religions of women of papal right are directly subject to the Holy See. Of these the Holy See can, as it deems fit, delegate some things to its immediate Assistants or Delegates for Federations; and this habitually or for a case that has arisen.

2^o. In regard to *ambit or extension*, unless the small number of Monasteries or other just and proportionate causes require otherwise, Federations should be regional, for this facilitates government.

3^o. In regard to *moral persons*, whereof as collegial persons they are constituted, Federations are composed of Monasteries of the same Order and of the same internal observance, although not necessarily of the same subjection to a local Ordinary or a Regular Superior; neither need they have the same class of vows or the same form of enclosure.

4^o. If necessity, great advantage, or the traditions of orders suggest it, Confederations of regional Federations may be admitted.

5^o. In regard to the independence of Monasteries, the bond whereby federated Monasteries are bound to each other must be such as not to be opposed to autonomy, at least essential autonomy (c. 488, 2^o, 8^o). Although derogations of autonomy are not to be presumed, they can, however, be granted, with the previous consent of the Monasteries, should grave causes suggest or demand it.

XXIV. Before they can be erected, all Federations of Monasteries of Nuns must have their own Statutes to be approved by the Holy See. In these Statutes there must be accurately defined chiefly:

1^o. The ends which each Federation sets before it;

2^o. The way in which the government of the Federation is to be ordered, either as regards the elements of which it is to consist, as, for instance, a President, Visitatresses, a Council, etc., or as regards the way of designating persons for those charges, or as regards the power and mode of procedure of the government;

3^o. The means which the Federation is to use, in order to attain the ends which it pursues gently and strongly;

4^o. The conditions and ways of executing what is laid down in Art. VII, § 3, n. 2^o of the Constitution "*Sponsa Christi*" and in n. XXII of this Instruction about the mutual communication of persons;

5^o. The juridical condition of a Nun transferred to another Monastery, either in the Monastery from which she is transferred, or in the Monastery to which she is transferred;

6^o. The economic co-operation which is to be given by each Monastery to the common works of the whole Federation;

7^o. The government either of the common novitiate or of other common works, if such exist.

XXV. 1^o. In order that the Holy See may be able to exercise direct and effective vigilance and authority on the Federation, a religious Assistant may be given to any Federation, as necessity or utility suggests.

2^o. The religious Assistant, after those concerned are heard, according to the Statutes, is nominated by the S. Congregation.

3^o. In each case his duties shall be defined in the document of his nomination. These are the chief duties: to see that the genuine spirit of a life profoundly contemplative and the spirit of the particular Order and Institute is secured and kept and increased in the Federation; likewise, that a prudent and right government is set up and retained in the Federation; to look to the solid religious instruction of the Novices and the Religious themselves; to assist the Council in more important economic matters.

4^o. The Assistant will be, as it were, an Assessor, with due regard to the norms to be laid down for each Federation.

5^o. The Holy See will delegate to him, according as cases arise, some other powers or will commit to him opportune functions.

Monastic Labour

XXVI. 1^o. Since the temporal needs of life, by an ordering of Divine Providence, are sometimes so pressing that Nuns are morally compelled to seek and accept other works besides their usual works, to modify their time-table, occasionally even to increase the time given to work, let them all, like the faithful in similar circumstances, submit themselves promptly and humbly, as good Religious to the dispositions of Divine Providence.

2^o. This must not, however, be anxiously or lightly or arbitrarily done, but prudently, as far as it shows itself to be really necessary or becoming, seeking in simplicity of soul the proper harmony between a sense of fidelity to the letter and tradition, on one hand, and filial subjection to the permissions and ordinance of Divine Providence, on the other.

3^o. With these things in mind, let the dispositions which seem to be needful, be submitted, as cases arise, to the ecclesiastical or religious authority.

XXVII. Ecclesiastical and Religious Superiors should:

1^o. In every way seek and procure fruitful labour for Nuns who need it, using men, if the case admits it, besides other decent devices, committees of pious women or men, or even cautiously and prudently using external societies constituted for such a purpose;

2^o. Prudently supervise the perfection and order of the works, and see that the Nuns are justly remunerated for them;

3^o. Diligently attend to the co-ordination of the works of labour done by different Monasteries, so that they help each other mutually and supply and supplement, while every kind of emulation is eschewed.

Everything to the contrary notwithstanding.

Given at Rome, from the Palace of the Sacred Congregation of Religious, the 23rd day of November, in the Holy Year, 1950.

C. Card. MICARA, Bp. of Velletri, *Prefect*.

A. Larraona, C.M.F., *Secretary*.

W. LEONARD.

*

*

*

*

"PRIVATE REVELATION AND A RECENT BOOK"

Dr. Toal would like readers of his article in the *A.C.R.*, October, 1951, to make the following corrections, which escaped the notice of the proof-reader:

Page 305, line 13 to read:

....can take in this light only when broken....

Page 305, line 20 should read:

....the day to day narrative of journeying....

Page 305, line 33 should read:

....in its integrity, to men, is, within the Church's magisterium, entrusted to the....

Page 309, footnote, penultimate line should read:

....But the resisting action, here the....

Priestly Perfection

Sancta sancte tractanda sunt. There is no denial that the Priesthood demands of the candidate who presents himself for ordination a high degree of sanctity, and that his subsequent life in the exercise of his ministry should be a constant endeavour to make himself more and more holy. During our Seminary days, the need for striving after perfection was incessantly placed before us; it was stressed at retreats and frequent spiritual conferences, and brought home to us perhaps with the strongest conviction by the study of our Theology. The deeper our knowledge of the meaning of the Priesthood and of our active part in the plan of the divine work of Redemption, the more we felt the force of the obligation that was ours to make ourselves at least less unworthy of our vocation and ever ready to remove whatever would be an obstacle to the workings of God's special providence in our regard. Lest our contact with the world should cause us to forget our duty to stir up the grace that is in us by the imposition of hands, the Canon Law urges the Bishops to see that their priests perform with all fidelity the exercises of piety and religion that experience has proved play such an important part in the formation of a saintly soul (Cf. cann. 124 seq.) Within the last half century, the Vicars of Christ have repeatedly stressed the importance of holiness in the Priest, and have written memorable letters to the Clergy of the Universal Church, full of instruction and exhortation.

The purpose of these few lines is not to traverse again the road that has been so well marked in the past, but merely to endeavour to view in its correct perspective the perfection required of the Priest. Many of the thoughts here expressed were suggested by the recent Exhortation of Pope Pius XII, *Menti Nostrae* (23rd September, 1950) and His Allocution (8th December, 1950) to the Superiors of Religious Institutes gathered at Rome for a general convention of far-reaching importance. Our remarks concern the obligations of the Priest as such, whether he be secular or religious, and we wish to emphasise the fact of the Priesthood itself as a reason for perfection of life.

The perfection of the Christian life, the Holy Father assures us, in the Exhortation *Menti Nostrae* (A.A.S., 1950, p. 660) consists chiefly of charity towards God and our neighbour, a charity which is ardent, earnest and productive of good works. It thus embraces, in a sense, all

the virtues, and can be called in the words of the Apostle "the bond of perfection" (Col. 3/14). To live in such a manner that these two great commandments, love of God and of our neighbour, are faithfully observed is the aim of all who are sincere in their profession of Christianity. Perfection is thus not to be thought of as restricted to any particular section of the members of the Church; it is within the capabilities of each one by correspondence with the gift of grace. Some, it is true, are given more abundant graces or co-operate with them more faithfully, and so reach a higher degree of perfection in this life and enjoy a greater glory in heaven. To favoured souls our Lord extends the invitation to devote their lives to seek perfection by observing not merely the commandments, but what are known as the evangelical counsels. They surrender their wills by a vow of obedience, their bodies by that of chastity and they renounce their worldly possessions or the unrestricted use of them by a vow of poverty. When these vows are recognised by the Church, because they are taken in an Institute which is canonically erected, they are public vows which place the person who makes them in the canonical state of Religious. The Religious state is also known as the state of perfection, or more accurately the state of acquiring perfection—*status perfectionis acquirendae*. It does not follow that religious profession of itself produces perfection; profession is rather the public and permanent assumption of a definite way to perfection, which was pointed out by our divine Lord, encouraged by the Church and recognised by her as a state worthy of honour. The religious is protected by many privileges as he is likewise liable to severe penalties for violation of the duties he has assumed.

Though the Priest in common with the laity and more so, as we shall see, should aim at perfection, he is not bound to embrace the canonical "state of perfection", which as the Holy Father points out is common to both clergy and laity. The distinction between the clergy and the laity is indeed of divine institution, but both classes may embrace the *status perfectionis acquirendae* (Allocution, *A.A.S.*, 1951, p. 28). The Religious life does not include the Priesthood, and in fact is open to the female sex, who are incapable of receiving Holy Orders. Neither is the Priesthood to be confused with the Religious State. The Religious State was instituted to bring men to perfection—that may be described as its *finis operis*; the Priesthood, on the other hand, does not produce perfection, it supposes it already, no matter by what manner it was obtained. The Religious who is presented for Ordination by his

superior has doubtless had the helps of his state of life in the preparation for the Priesthood, but there are other means of obtaining that intimate union with God by charity required in the candidate for Orders than the adoption of the Religious life. In the present discipline of the Church, since the days of the Council of Trent, the years of the Seminary provide for the candidate for the secular clergy the means to sanctify his soul; and indeed the religious must also spend the required time in a Seminary or House of Studies in preparation for the Priesthood. During this long period, the levite has at his disposal the means indicated by the Church to prepare his soul for the reception of Holy Orders: a strong faith made lively by study and meditation on the divine truths, love of God and conformity to His will, union with our divine Lord made more intimate by the daily reception of Holy Communion, love of his neighbour exemplified in his companions, obedience to his superiors, chastity, zeal for the glory of God and the spread of the Church, mortification, devotion to the Mother of God and the Saints, and the rest. He dwells in the house of God, his fellow students are animated by the same spirit as himself and urge him on, his participation in the Liturgy makes him realise his clerical state. In matters of conscience, he has at hand the advice and help of the spiritual director. With all these at his disposal, if he does not prepare himself effectively for Ordination, it is entirely his own fault. The Seminary course does not place him in the canonical state of perfection, but gives him abundant means to become perfect. The Priesthood itself is a cogent reason why a man should be perfect. The truth of this statement is more apparent if we consider the results of the reception of Orders by one who has not placed himself under a superior to whose obedience he is bound in the observance of a common life according the approved Constitutions of a Religious Institute. His initial dedication by the reception of Tonsure has an effect of another kind, for by his Incardination into a Diocese thus effected, he is placed under the jurisdiction of a Bishop with whom he is destined to be united intimately in due course in the discharge of sacred functions. The reception of the Orders vests him with various powers *ad sacra tradenda*, and his final consecration in priestly Ordination makes him a member of the *Presbyterium*, tuned to the Bishop like the strings of a harp. His is the *secundi meriti munus*, and he is a co-operator, in the lower grade of the Priesthood, with the Bishop in the work of teaching, and ruling and sanctifying the flock of Christ. The reason for the

Priesthood, even in a Religious, is not primarily for the salvation of his own soul, but to save the souls of others. Authority to exercise the priestly powers must be committed in every case by the divinely constituted Pastor of the Diocese. This is the economy instituted by Christ, and the Holy Father remarks (Allocution, *A.A.S.*, 1951, p. 28, 29) the law of exemption in no wise is in contradiction to the law that the priest must obey the Bishop. The Canon Law requires that exempt religious are subject to the authority of the Bishop, as the Episcopal office and the correctly regulated care of souls demands. Apart from this, exempt religious are subject to the Supreme Pastor by reason of their vow of obedience, and the jurisdiction of the Vicar of Christ is immediate and ordinary, embracing all Christians. The dispenser of the mysteries of God must be holy and perfect, but it is not necessary that he embrace the *status perfectionis acquirendae* as a means to attain the perfection required by his priestly Order. Besides a consciousness of his intimate union with our divine Lord, the Author of all sanctity to Whom he is conformed by the character of the Priesthood, he has other helps to make him perfect in charity. He must observe chastity: the church has placed this obligation on him as most in harmony with his priestly state and its sacred duties. He is not called upon at Ordination to renounce either the use or possession of his temporal goods, though he is expected to regard them as a means to further the work of his mission. He does not bind himself by vow to be obedient in all things to the Bishop: outside the matters which directly or indirectly bear on his position as a Priest, his activities are his own to arrange and execute, but his promise of reverence and obedience are ever before his mind. He must be chaste, he must be poor in spirit, and he must be obedient, for otherwise he will not be a worthy priest.

In the practice of these virtues he will also find a wonderful means to preserve the sanctity that was expected of him on the day of his Ordination. The observance of chastity, poverty and obedience does not constitute the priestly state, as the vows constitute the *status perfectionis acquirendae*, but is rather an obligation consequent on the reception of Orders; and in preparation for the priesthood there has been long practice of the virtues referred to during the years spent in the Seminary. The perfection of a Priest, then, is not a mere half-hearted gift of himself to God, an imitation from afar of the life of a Religious; it is something which springs from different motives and is

acquired by different means. In the discharge of his duties he will spontaneously divest himself of whatever hinders the execution of his divine work; and if he is in earnest, he will and must become more and more perfect.

To sum up: The Priesthood was not instituted to produce perfection, its sanctity demands close union with God in charity already acquired. Nevertheless, in his efforts to save others the priest will find that the exercise of his Priesthood is a most powerful means to ever increasing perfection.

JAMES MADDEN.

Bishop Willson, X.

THE DISPUTE BETWEEN DR. WILLSON AND FATHER THERRY.

(1st Phase: Part 2, 1845-1847.)

Summary: Attempts to end quarrel—Advice of Solicitor-General—Therry returns to Sydney, where he is warmly welcomed—Dr. Gregory, O.S.B., sent to Hobart—He tells Willson to resign the See—Failure of Gregory's mission—Dr. Willson informs laity of the quarrel by pastoral letter—Agreement of July 2, 1846—Fresh difficulties arise—Dr. Willson leaves on trip to England—Decision of Caveat Commissioners.

The dispute had by this time begun to attract public attention, causing a division in the community. Several leading citizens, though not of the Catholic faith, offered their services as peacemakers. Robert Pitcairn thought that arbitration might succeed where meetings and conferences only threatened to advertise a disedifying conflict. Father Therry appeared inclined to accept his advice. On 12th December the priest addressed Colonial Secretary Bicheno:

"Having been recently obliged to mortgage my house for a sum of £600 for the purpose principally of paying the debts on account of a Church which I had the honor to build, and from which as a clergyman I am now excluded, and this sum being now exhausted, or nearly so, I have no further means at present to meet the heavy demands that continue to be made on the same account. The Rt. Rev. Dr. Willson having taken my salary of £600 per annum, and has thought it proper in the exercise of his strictly canonical right to appoint another clergyman to the office of Vicar-General, and has prohibited my performance of any ecclesiastical duty, I am now, and have been for the last six months, left without either salary or income of any kind. Some of my avowed enemies, with an object not to be mistaken, have assured His Lordship that my property in New South Wales is very considerable, and that, therefore, I should be compelled to pay a large portion of the Church debts. I admit that it is considerable; but in consequence of the general depression I do not now, nor do I expect for a long time, to derive any income from it. As I have an almost insuperable reluctance to resort to law proceedings, even in defence of my character or property, of both of which the advisers of His Lordship seem anxious to have me deprived, I am the more disposed to adopt an advice that I have had to-day the honour to receive from a gentleman whom I highly revere, who is the Bishop's sincere and disinterested friend, and in whose prudence and honor I place the most implicit confidence—namely: leave the settlement of the differences now existing between His Lordship and myself to the uncontrolled management of three gentlemen whose character and position in society would protect them from the suspicion of being influenced in their decision by any improper motive. I have, therefore, Sir, to solicit you as a distinguished promoter of Christian peace to have the goodness to undertake with Captain Swanston and Mr. Pitcairn as Plenipotentiaries the adjustment of those differences".¹

¹*Tasmanian Government Records,*

The Bishop and "some of the principal members" of his flock unanimously declined entertaining Father Therry's proposal, as being "perfectly unreasonable". The plan submitted ignored Dr. Willson as Bishop of the Diocese and as a party to the disagreement. He and his advisers favoured the selection of four arbitrators on conditions that differed little from those put forward at an earlier date. Having pledged himself to use "all the influence he possessed to obtain funds for the liquidation of the debt as soon as possible," the Bishop added:

"I may say, as I do with all sincerity, that the vexatious delay of the settlement of this business is producing a strong feeling prejudicial to the interests of Mr. Therry. You will please to bear in mind that the large sum sought for is for five other buildings besides the Church: namely, the unfinished house, three buildings a few feet out of the ground, and the foundations of a second Church. Still, I am willing to exert myself to the utmost to procure funds, and I trust that the Catholics will do all that the pressure of the times will allow them. Should Mr. Therry, however, still resist that which is reasonable he will have to abide by the consequences and I must strive to obtain a Church, however humble, of which I can be, as Bishop, the legal possessor".²

There followed another move to try arbitration as the best means of arriving at a just estimate of the Church debt. On 28th December Father Therry put his signature to this statement:

"I am satisfied that the Honourable the Colonial Secretary or His Honour Judge Montagu should act as my arbitrator; or any other gentleman approved by them. Should Roderick O'Connor, Esq., M.L.C., be appointed by the Bishop, or the Catholic congregation, I shall have no objection to that appointment or to any other that may be approved by the former gentlemen".

Both Judge Montagu and the Colonial Secretary considered it best to submit the accounts to the Solicitor-General, Mr. V. Fleming. To this course the Bishop consented. The early weeks of the year 1845 were given to a painstaking scrutiny of all the evidence. This patient investigation did not yield any satisfactory conclusion. "Yet", said the arbitrator, "the parties might, by mutual consent and concession, adopt some plan to effect a final settlement".

Not waiting for the Solicitor-General's report, Father Therry, 10th February, 1845, had sailed for Sydney.³ The Archbishop received him cordially; as did Father McEncroe and Dr. Gregory. They invited him to preach in the Cathedral as well as to occupy a place of honour in ecclesiastical functions. With Dr. Polding's consent and support, friends opened a subscription list to help the priest to pay his debts. This action of the Sydney clerics was not to Bishop Willson's liking; he looked upon it as a public condemnation of his own conduct and policy.

²To Colonial Secretary.

³Passenger list.

Having read a transcript of the Solicitor-General's unsatisfactory Report, with its suggestion of a settlement "by mutual consent and concession", the Archbishop thought success could be won by compromise. He asked Father Therry to remain with him, while authorising the Rev. H. G. Gregory, O.S.B., to go to Hobart. Bishop Willson heard of this plan in an introductory note, dated 15th April, 1845:

"In view of bringing the differences which have arisen respecting the pecuniary liabilities of the Church to an adjustment I have requested the Rev. Mr. Therry not to proceed to Hobarton, but to depute a priest to act for him, thinking this arrangement would be more agreeable to Your Lordship. He has selected the Very Rev. Dr. Gregory, my Vicar-General, who is accompanied by the Rev. J. C. Sumner. To the Very Rev. Dr. Gregory, as my Vicar-General, I have delegated the fulness of jurisdiction as far as I may possess".

Not the best ambassador had been chosen for this delicate business. The relations between the Bishop of Hobart and Dr. Gregory had never been cordial. The letter of introduction, framed in terms out of harmony with canonical phraseology, did nothing to dispel the visiting cleric's notion of his own importance in the ecclesiastical firmament. Flourishing his authority in the face of the world, he pretended he had come to dictate rather than to discuss. He went so far as to propose Dr. Willson's withdrawal from the Colony so that another might be sent to rule the diocese. For this we have the Bishop's own written word. There exists, too, a statement made by the Rev. William Bond that "Dr. Gregory when in Hobart was guilty of the childish folly of telling Bishop Willson that he presented himself before him as his Superior, and that unless he consented to the conditions then proposed he had *'better resign his mitre'*, and that he was authorised to receive it from him; for which no apology has ever since been tendered to that venerable man, who received the insult with the meekness of a child".

The Solicitor-General, as before stated, had made a recommendation for an agreement based on "mutual consent and concession". Now requested to submit a definite figure as his estimate of the existing liabilities, Mr. Fleming replied, on 22nd April:

"What I had intended to convey in my Report was that, inasmuch as it is impossible, on the face of the accounts, to credit (I use the word simply as opposed to debit) Mr. Therry to the extent of the balance claimed by him, some relinquishment of his demand should be made with a view to a settlement by way of compromise. The data are too indistinct for me or, I think, for any other person to name the specific sum; but my investigation of the accounts induces the belief, on my part, that I am safe in saying that the relinquishment by Mr. Therry of £1000 from his demand would still leave a balance exceeding that with which he would be credited by any disinterested accountant".

From this hour Dr. Willson always acknowledged £2300 as the sum due to Father Therry. Several times, as shall be seen, the Bishop offered to carry a heavier burden, but in those instances he consented to do so "for peace; not for justice".

On 25th April it was agreed to take the debt as £2300, Dr. Gregory being willing to give up Father Therry's claim to the extra £1000, which would be obtained by an appeal outside Van Diemen's Land. Quite satisfied with this financial arrangement, the Bishop deputed his Vicar-General to come to terms as to details. Writing from Launceston, where he had gone to spend a few days as Father Butler's guest, he said:

"If the Church property be handed over to me as Bishop, and the debt acknowledged to be £2300, I will pledge myself to use my best endeavours to procure funds for the liquidation of that sum as soon as possible, and, with the assistance of my congregation, pay eight percent. per annum upon it, or any part of it unliquidated, until the whole be discharged".

With the consent of the Bishop, the Rev. H. G. Gregory guaranteed to pay John Regan £1600, over a period of six years, with interest as above. Father Hall promised to provide £700 within six months for the land on which St. Joseph's Church had been erected. With the £1000 to be raised by the Sydney Vicar-General the whole amount demanded by Father Therry would thus be discharged. All to no purpose. Although offered a legal bond, as far as concerned his own particular claim, John Regan refused to ratify the scheme. Admitting failure, Dr. Gregory left for Sydney on 18th June. Before his departure he paid some of Father Therry's debts with money that had been subscribed in New South Wales.⁴

One month later Father Therry himself came back to be offered by the Bishop the terms that had been accepted, if not actually proposed, by his representative. To Dr. Willson's communication—described by a Catholic meeting as a "fair and just proposition"—no reply came. Then, unexpectedly, on 15th August, an agreement, practically a copy of the above, was signed by both parties. This treaty at once became just another scrap of paper. The priest intimated that he did not mean to relinquish his claim for the £1000, but only not to *press at present* for its payment. At the time, Father Therry's supporters set about devising means to collect part of the money in Hobart. To this the Bishop could not give his sanction. Apart from other considerations, he himself would be appealing to the same people for the same purpose.

At this stage the clergy publicly took a hand. The whole body—six priests—met and expressed their conviction "after mature deliberation and careful consideration of the evidence produced that the maximum of the debt on the Hobart Town Church account does not exceed

⁴About £100 owing to Mr. Dunkley.

£2300, and the Bishop would not be justified in pressing on the resources of the community for a larger sum".

In October, 1845, the Bishop issued a pastoral on the State of St. Joseph's Church.⁵ Carefully and calmly, he revealed to the congregation much of what had been done to procure a settlement. Hitherto the facts had been hidden; there had been created a false impression by press reports and statements. Dr. Willson's first really public pronouncement completely silenced many of his critics. Still stronger could he have made his position had he printed the letters received from Archbishop Polding. These, however, were confidential.

Renewed efforts to bring the dissension to a happy conclusion marked the year 1846. Dr. Willson invited J. E. Bicheno, the Colonial Secretary, to put before Father Therry a proposal by which his full claim would be recognised. On January 30, the Bishop learned that the priest appeared even less disposed than usual to retreat one inch from the position he had taken up:

"I have had an interview, as you wished, with the Rev. J. J. Therry; but I find the view he takes of the whole subject so diametrically opposed to your own, and to sustain his view with a temper and language so vehement, that I have no hope, at present, of his falling in with your proposition. He will trust nobody without legal responsibility. I would persuade him that for the Bishop, or any clergyman, to enter into bill transactions which require that the bills should be kept afloat by renewals, is inconsistent with his station, and that I thought he had done wrong in ever carrying on the building of the Church by such means: that no friend of the Bishop could advise him to such a course. I have told Mr. Therry distinctly that you are willing to give every pledge consistent with your character that the debt shall be paid if he will only come to an understanding so that you may be left free to act and unfettered. I hinted to him the desirability of taking this pledge as sufficient to guarantee the payment, and that he should retire to the other Colony; but his expressions were so strong that I could only be justified in repeating one of them from the importance of this to the Catholic Community: 'I intend to stay with him until I am crushed, please the Lord'. I am sorry for so unhappy a conclusion to my efforts to bring about an adjustment".⁶

Writing to the Bishop at this time, Charles Swanson—often referred to as 'Therry's friend'—says: "Your Lordship, in my opinion, has done all you can."—And, on February 4, the same gentleman made known his mind to Father Therry:

"I have seen the proposition made to you by the Bishop, and I must say that it is everything that you or any other person placed in your situation can require. It is fair—it is just—it is honourable; and you should not, and ought not to require more if you really have the good of your Church at heart".

In March his solicitors sent Father Therry a proposal made by Dr. Willson through Robert Pitcairn. The priest would receive £700 at once, and £2,600 within three years in five equal instalments; while

⁵Four printed copies in *Hobart Archives*.

⁶*Willson Papers*.

the Church property was to be vested in trustees elected by the Catholic people. To Butler, Son, and Nutt, his legal representatives, Father Therry replied:

"With reference to the proposal . . . provided legal and sufficient security be offered by the Rt. Rev. Bishop or any of his friends to the Church creditors for the punctual payment of the five instalments respectively at the periods therein specified the trustees will at once undertake with the sanction of your advice to induce those creditors to accept the proposal".

The Bishop went off to Norfolk Island, leaving his Vicar-General to continue or to re-open negotiations should there appear any hope of agreement. The offer above outlined was renewed on June 4th with verbal alterations, at Father Therry's desire, in a clause relating to mortgage. Robert Pitcairn wrote:

"I gave Mr. Therry a copy of the above memorandum a few days ago, when Mr. Hall was out of town. It is the same as a previous memorandum made in March, with the exception of the fourth clause, which I altered at Mr. Therry's request, stating that I had no doubt Mr. Hall would consent to the alteration. Mr. Hall did consent on his return. Of this I informed Mr. Therry, who called at my office on Monday last. He then said he hoped some actions which had been brought would be immediately paid out of the £700. I stated to him that the Bishop could not interfere with any action, and that if Mr. Therry would furnish a list of the creditors for the £3300 he (Mr. Therry) might himself specify what particular debts the £700 should go in liquidation of; and it should be applied accordingly—that there need be no delay; as the only thing to be done was to prepare a short transfer of St. Joseph's and the other property of the Church to the *Trustees elected in December last*, which could be signed at the same time that the £700 was paid or provided for. I had mentioned that the £700 might not be all paid in cash, but that either cash or bills that would satisfy the creditors would be provided to that amount.

"To my great surprise, Mr. Therry said he would not consent to the property being conveyed to the Trustees. I pointed out to him that he had not only *agreed to the memorandum* (above), but had been anxious to obtain Dr. Hall's approval of it. He replied that he meant the Church property to be transferred to the Trustees *after* the Act in Council was obtained, and (I think he added) the money obtained on mortgage. After reasoning with him upon the impossibility of my recommending payment of the £700 while everything was left in its present state of confusion I told him it was quite in vain to attempt any further negotiation with him".

Having had a conference with Father Therry and his Solicitor, Robert Pitcairn told the Bishop:

"The conclusion to which I arrive is that Mr. Therry will do nothing towards any arrangement respecting the Church property unless he is *legally* indemnified and secured against the present debt. There are no means of giving him this indemnity and security unless Your Lordship gives up all control over the property. Further negotiation seems, therefore, to be of no advantage".

With his mind made up to visit the homeland in the interests of the men at Norfolk Island the Bishop showed himself more anxious than ever to have all at peace in his diocese. Again he approached the problem in consultation with his clergy. He decided to ask the priests with their congregations to find the £2,300 which he believed to be the sum justly due, while making himself personally responsible for £1,000. As

the Government had previously refused "to sacrifice the future interests of the Catholic people to a present difficulty," a clause dealing with the raising of funds by a mortgage on Church property was not to be used to impede or retard a settlement. After preliminary discussions the Bishop and Father Therry, on July 2nd, signed this Agreement:

"The Bishop and clergy give a written assurance that the sum of £3300 shall be paid, with eight per cent. interest per annum, as follows: £700 to Mr. Therry (£300 in cash at once, and remove personal responsibilities for £400), and the remaining £2600 in instalments over three yeears at eight per cent. interest. Should unforeseen circumstances occur preventing the full payment at the time specified the balance shall be paid as soon after as possible with the above rate of interest. By this arrangement neither Bishop nor clergy incur any personal responsibility. The Church property is to be vested immediately according to Act of Council in the Trustees elected in December last".

The clergy went to their homes happy in the belief that peace had been at length vouchsafed to the Church in Hobart. But their joy was soon converted into grief. The Agreement got into the press: but not the full text. Nothing was said, for example, about the essential condition dealing with the immediate surrender of the property. This mutilated version of the contract would foster the notion that Dr. Willson had finally admitted all the claims made against him while leaving Father Therry in legal possession of Church property.⁷ The Bishop privately forwarded a copy of the complete Agreement,—approved by the Solicitors of both parties as had been resolved by the clergy at their conference,—asking Father Therry to attach his signature; stating that Messrs. Regan and Insley had approved of the document; and declaring it to be his final offer. In his reply, Father Therry made the amazing statement that he would not "willingly depart from the agreement made on 2nd July, which was signed both by Your Lordship and myself." Fathers Butler, Dunne, Cotham, and Bond all protested in letters to Father Therry that the account of the Agreement placed before the public differed from that to which they had consented. He did not notice their communications.

Critics of Dr. Willson pretended that he had repudiated this Agreement of July 2, 1846, thus causing the failure of a sincere and satisfactory bid for peace. The Bishop himself thought otherwise, as may be seen in an extract from one of his letters to Father Therry:

"In 1846, as I was about to visit Europe, and with the hope of putting an end to the shameful scandal which was afflicting the Church from the public press . . . I did consent, in order to *purchase peace and not for justice* to offer to pay £3300 on *condition* that a *grant of the land should issue to the Church Trustees*. I refer you to the letters of the Revds. Cotham, Butler, Dunne, and Bond, addressed to you on that occasion. This consent was not given on the ground that you could justly claim £3300, but for *the purpose of securing peace*. Did you not,

⁷With several clauses added by way of "interpretation".

two Sundays before I left for Europe, August, 1846, when I knelt before you with the image of Jesus in my hands, reject with great energy this offer, and say you would *never give up the land unless legal security* was given for the sum then offered?"

Following the abortive efforts to reach a settlement Father Therry went to Melbourne, in August, to officiate there during the absence of the Rev. P. B. Geoghegan. The Bishop, too, was about to leave the diocese, having booked his passage to England. The Church in Hobart could look forward to enjoy eighteen months of comparative quiet. In April, 1847, Father Therry re-visited the scene of his former labours, "having at his own request obtained permission to visit Van Diemen's Land for the purpose of transacting some business of a private nature."⁸ Then he continued his journey to Sydney. Did his presence arouse the Rev. William Hall to claim legal possession of the site occupied by St. Joseph's Church? The Caveat Commissioners, to whom he had recourse, did not issue grants: they adjudicated on disputed claims, their verdict being a recommendation to the Government. As soon as the Vicar-General announced his intention a *caveat* was entered in the names of J. J. Therry of Sydney, John Regan and William Insley of Hobart, claiming that £4,225, received from various sources, had been expended in the erection of buildings. The priest and his colleagues, it was asserted, had devoted large sums of their own monies to the same purpose in excess of the total collected; and they had done so with the knowledge and concurrence of the Catholic community, and upon the understanding that the property was to be held as security.

The Caveat Commissioners, on 26th October, gave their decision:

Upon a review of the prolonged enquiry which has taken place and the examinations now before us, we are not of opinion that the expenditure in excess took place, as is alleged, with the knowledge and concurrence of the Roman Catholic community, or upon the understanding that the parties to the *caveat* were to look to the property as their security: and did we hold that when persons entrusted with the erection of churches mingle advances of their own with the free contributions of others, and with monies voted by Council, that they by so doing create in their own favour an interest in or charge upon the premises, we cannot but think that we should be sanctioning a principle which, on the one hand, might open a door to fraud, and, on the other, destroy confidence; and so diminish in many cases the liberality of the public. Under these circumstances, therefore, we are of opinion that in equity and good conscience the *caveat* cannot be sustained; and we think that the views under which we have arrived derive additional force from the provisions of the Church Act".

Father Hall now went a step further: he paid the debt on the land, thus reducing Father Therry's claim by £700.

JOHN H. CULLEN.

(To be continued)

⁸See E. M. O'Brien, *The Life of Archpriest J. J. Therry*, Sydney, 1922, p. 257.

Dogmatic Theology

THE THEOLOGY OF THE MASS. VI. THE SUPPER — THE CROSS — THE MASS.

It would be no exaggeration to say that the most vital and most practical question for modern students of the Mass is this: What is the relation of the Mass to the Sacrifice of the Cross? Are they one and the same sacrifice? And if the answer is in the affirmative, in what sense are they one and the same? Or are they two essential parts of the one complete sacrifice? Or are they two specifically distinct sacrifices, yet bound together in a close unity? For some, these questions form what one theologian has been pleased to describe "the unsolved problem of Mass-Theology."

The chief difficulty that confronts us is that of reducing the vast and complex matter to some satisfactory order that will leave us with a clear concept of the whole doctrine of New Testament Sacrifice, involving as it does the Supper, the Cross, and the Mass. First of all, there are certain great, fundamental questions that must be faced; and it is only when they have been decided that we shall be in a position to assess the relations that exist between the Supper, the Cross, and the Mass. We shall deal with those fundamentals in a series of assertions, hoping that such a plan will make for clarity if nothing else. After that we shall try to place the Cenacle, the Cross, and the Altar before our eyes in their several similarities and differences.

ASSERTION I:

The Mass is specifically the same sacrificial rite that Christ performed at the Last Supper, though, of course, numerically different because it is repeated again and again.

The assertion states that Christ our Lord celebrated our Mass in the Cenacle. There He ordained His first priests and gave them the command to perform again and again that very same sacrificial rite that He there instituted. That is the definitive teaching of the Council of Trent: "Our Lord, at the Last Supper, on the night in which He was betrayed, . . . manifesting Himself as a Priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech, offered to God the Father His Body and Blood under the species of bread and wine; and He commanded His Apostles, whom He there constituted priests of the New Covenant, and their successors in the Priesthood, to offer His Body and Blood under

the species of those same things, when He said to them: 'Do this for a commemoration of Me'. This the Church has always understood and taught. . . . There He instituted the New Pasch,—Himself to be immolated by the Church, through her priests, under visible signs".¹ Hence the expression so dear to St. Peter Canisius, and so frequently on his lips when instructing the faithful: "What else did Christ do at the Supper but say Mass?"

Now, in what did the sacrificial action of the Supper consist? Was it a true, complete sacrifice? This presents a great problem to so many. But if what we have written in the foregoing articles, particularly in the last one, be true, surely the problem is simply non-existent. We have shown that the Mass is a true sacrifice, consisting essentially of oblation and immolation of Christ, the Victim. And we have further shown that the Mass is in fact a true sacrifice *formally and precisely* because Christ the Victim is therein immolated in an unbloody manner, by the sacramental separation of His Body and Blood under the separate species of bread and wine. In other words, we have seen that *the formal constituent* of the Mass as a true sacrifice is found in the sacramental, or mystical, immolation of the Victim. Among our proofs was that taken from the words of Pope Pius XII, the latest authentic interpreter of the sources of Revelation: "It must be emphasized again and again that the Eucharistic Sacrifice is essentially the unbloody immolation of the Divine Victim, an immolation mystically manifested in the separation of the sacred species. . . ."² Now, if that is true on the one hand, and if, on the other it is true that the Mass is specifically the same identical rite that Christ performed at the Supper, we are necessarily forced to conclude that in the Supper Christ offered a true, complete sacrifice which was formally constituted by the sacramental, or mystical, immolation of His Body and Blood under the separate species of bread and wine.

Once it is accepted that the Mass is formally constituted a sacrifice by that sacramental immolation effected by the word-sword of the Consecration, all difficulties fall away, all controversies cease. Then the sacrifice of the Cenacle, the sacrifice of the Altar, and the sacrifice of the Cross are seen in their true relationship. That is why the preceding article on Sacramental Immolation is so important. If one accepts what was stated there he has seen the end of his difficulties.

¹Sess. 22, C.R. 1; Denzinger, 938.

²Cf. A.C.R., Oct., 1951, pp. 332 ff.

The Eucharistic action of Christ at the Last Supper was by no means restricted to a mere *ritual oblation* of Himself, as some would have us believe, — an oblation that had to await the morrow, when it would be united to the bloody immolation of Calvary, together with which it constituted one complete sacrifice. No! There in the Cenacle the Redeemer was immolated, sacramentally, and there He made the oblation of Himself in a true, perfect, though sacramental, sacrifice. That, as we have seen, is the Mass. And in the Cenacle Christ celebrated Mass. He did what He told His Apostles to do, for, says the Council of Trent, “having celebrated the ancient Pasch, which the children of Israel were accustomed to *immolate* in memory of their departure from Egypt, He instituted the New Pasch, — Himself to be *immolated* by the Church, through her priests, *under visible signs*.” But He did first what He commanded His priests to do after Him. He immolated Himself there; He placed the formal constituent of the Mass there; He said the First Mass there. He, the spotless Paschal Lamb, was mystically slain there, and only after He was immolated, *yea, because* He had been immolated there, was He given to His Apostles to be eaten.

Christ plainly said that His Body was truly delivered up to death there in the supper-room: This is my Body which is given in sacrifice for you. He clearly said that His Blood was poured out in sacrifice there in the supper-room. And St. Luke makes it plain that it was His Blood *precisely and formally as contained in the Chalice* that was poured out sacrificially for the remission of sins.³ All the requisites of a true, complete, perfect sacramental sacrifice were present in Christ’s sacrificial action in the Cenacle. Moreover, our Lord assured us that the New Covenant, like the Old, was sealed and ratified by the Blood of a Victim, His Blood, poured out in sacrifice there: “This is the New Covenant in My Blood”.

There, as St. Irenaeus handed down, “Christ acknowledged the Chalice of His Blood, and taught *the New Sacrifice of the New Testament*, which the Church has received from the Apostles and offers to God throughout the whole world”. Yes, it was the same sacrifice that we offer on our altars: the oblation of the Divine Victim sacramentally immolated. It was a true, complete perfect sacrifice, because it was the Mass.

Besides, if our High Priest did not offer a true sacrifice under the

³When proving that the Mass is a true sacrifice we brought out this full meaning of the words of institution as given in the original text.

species of bread and wine at the Supper, He never did fulfil the figure of Melchisedech, — contrary to what Trent teaches. For, on the Cross He sacrificed after the manner of Aaron, being a bloodily immolated Victim in the hands of a Priest, red with sacrifice. But, if He offered a true sacrifice in the cenacle, most certainly He immolated there, for without immolation there is certainly no sacrifice. And if He immolated there, it was most certainly a sacramental immolation, which constituted a sacramental sacrifice.

Let us recall the voice of Tradition that sounded in the clear, powerful words of St. Gregory of Nyssa whom we quoted elsewhere. “Of His own accord Christ forestalls them (the Jews), and *by a hidden kind of sacrifice He offers Himself as a sacrifice and immolates Himself as a victim*, He who is at the same time Priest and Lamb of God, who takes away the sins of the world. When did He do this? When He gave to His Disciples His Body to eat and His Blood to drink. He then plainly showed that *the sacrifice of the Lamb was already completed*; for the body of a victim would not be suitable to eat if it were not slain. Hence, when He gave to His Disciples His Body to be eaten and His Blood to be drunk, *His Body was already immolated in an ineffable and invisible manner*, in accordance with the power of Him who performed the mystery”.

But why do we labour the point? For, if Christ did not offer a true, complete sacrifice at the Last Supper, we are in a miserable and intolerable position; for, since the Mass is that very rite which Christ performed there, it would follow that the Mass, whatever else it be, is no true sacrifice! Where, then, shall we look for the Clean Oblation that God promised through Malachias as the hope of the nations?

We therefore place our second assertion, which already appears evident and inevitable:

ASSERTION II.

At the Last Supper our Lord offered a true, complete, perfect, sacramental sacrifice which, since it was the Mass, was formally constituted by the sacramental immolation of His Body and Blood under the separate species of bread and wine.

This brings us to a consideration of the relation of the Sacrifice offered in the Cenacle to that other, that bloody sacrifice of Calvary. We shall briefly discuss this matter in the two assertions to follow immediately. The question has two great aspects. Firstly, were the Supper and the Cross two *numerically distinct* sacrifices, or two essential parts of

one numerical sacrifice? Secondly, did the sacrifices of the Supper and the Cross differ *specifically*, or only numerically as one Mass differs from another?

Again, if what we have stated concerning the Mass and its formal constituent be accepted, no difficulty will be found in giving a logically deduced answer to those two questions. We must answer that the Supper and the Cross are *two sacrifices numerically and adequately distinct*. And we must also answer that they, as sacrifices, are also *specifically distinct*.

That is our position. It is the position known as *sacrificial Dualism*, because it defends the traditional teaching that Christ offered two true, complete, adequately distinct sacrifices, which yet were bound together in close unity, the one bearing essential relationship to the other. It is radically opposed to the position of the comparatively small modern school, whose most enthusiastic leader was Fr. de la Taille. His stimulating influence on modern Mass-theology will last long and healthily: he, more than any theologian since Trent, brought the minds of theologians to bear on the Christian Sacrifice. That is why everyone, even those who depart from him at every point of his teaching, is deeply in his debt.

The search for unity of Cross and Altar, of the bloody and the unbloody, of the passible and the impassible, of the one and the many,—that is the distinctive characteristic of this modern school. They maintain that Christ performed *one only sacrifice*, numerically and specifically one. That sacrifice, they say, consisted of two essential elements: the ritual oblation of the Victim, which took place in the Cenacle; and the bloody immolation of Calvary. Thus, in the supper-room Christ did not offer a true, complete sacrifice, but a part-sacrifice. It became complete only when it was united to the other essential constituent, the bloody immolation of the Cross. Hence, these theologians are termed “Unicists”.

And the Mass? They would have us believe that there is no new sacrificial immolation of Christ on the altar. The Mass consists essentially in the *liturgical oblation* of that bloody immolation of Calvary. That is the one and only immolation of Christ, never repeated, never mystically renewed, but unceasingly recalled and obliterated. In our last article we made several observations on this theory of the Mass, pointing out that, in our judgment, it does not appear consonant with the teachings of the Church, of Sacred Scripture, Tradition, and of sound sacrifice-theology.⁴ Nevertheless, it will not be useless to give further

⁴Cf. A.C.R., Oct., 1951, pp. 324 ff.

consideration to the matter. If we can show from authoritative sources that Christ offered two numerically distinct sacrifices, the theory of the Unicist school will be radically refuted. This we shall now attempt.

ASSERTION III.

Christ, our Lord, offered two complete, adequately distinct sacrifices, one in the Cenacle, the other on Calvary.

For anyone who wholeheartedly clings to the truth of our second assertion, the method of procedure here is one of utmost simplicity. All he has to do is to show what Tradition has always taught, namely, that Christ performed on Calvary a true sacrifice that was complete and all-perfect in itself and of itself, quite independently of anything that took place in the supper-room. The logical, intrinsic connection of his exposition would thus be evident and perfectly satisfactory. There would be no equivocation, no far-fetched interpretation of words and phrases used by the Church in her pronouncements on the matter.

For example, when the Council of Trent solemnly proclaimed: "If anyone says that *the sacrifice* of the Mass . . . is only a naked commemoration of *the sacrifice* enacted on the Cross, let him be anathema", we immediately conclude to a *duality of sacrifices*.⁵ We obviously infer what the Church obviously teaches, namely, that Christ on Calvary offered *a true sacrifice*; not a part-sacrifice, not the completion or consummation of a sacrifice elsewhere begun, but a true and perfect sacrifice in itself and of itself. Similarly, when the Church anathematizes those who say "that by *the sacrifice* of the Mass a blasphemy is committed against *the most holy sacrifice of Christ that was performed on the Cross*", we do not quibble. We hold simply that upon Calvary Christ did perform a true, complete, all-perfect sacrifice. We do not play fast and loose with the Church's pronouncements. But we would certainly feel guilty of doing so if we simply denied that Calvary saw the enactment of a complete, perfect sacrifice. Never, in any of her solemn pronouncements or her ordinary Magisterium, has the Church implied or openly taught that the priestly *oblation* of the sacrifice of Calvary was made outside the actual passion of the Redeemer. On the contrary, all the pronouncements of the Church leave it quite clear that *the whole sacrifice* of Redemption was wrought in the actual passion and death of Christ. And this teaching has passed into her liturgy, as one would expect. Thus, in the Preface of the Mass of Christ the King, she prays: "Eternal God, Who didst anoint thy only-begotten Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, eternal Priest and King of all, so

⁵Sess. 22, canon 3; Denzinger 950; canon 4, 951.

that by offering Himself on the altar of the Cross as an immaculate victim of reconciliation he might perform the sacred work of human redemption" etc. How could we possibly conclude that He did not actually make an oblation of Himself, an immolated victim, right there on the Cross?

Is not that the central theme of St. Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews, where the bloody sacrifice and the Priesthood of Jesus Christ are compared with the bloody sacrifices of the Old Law and the priesthood of Aaron, and are shown to have transcended them all?⁶ Shall we, then, conclude that Christ's sacrifice on Calvary was only a part-sacrifice, and that His sacerdotal action there was only half a sacerdotal act, and therefore that both His bloody sacrifice and His Priesthood fell far short of the perfection found in their mere figures and types under the Old Law?

It is quite contrary to the whole of our Catholic Tradition to say that the sacrifice of the Cross was not of itself and by itself a complete, all-perfect sacrifice. St. Augustine assures us that the death of Christ was "a most true sacrifice"; that it was "the oblation of a unique sacrifice, of which all the sacrifices of the Law and the Prophets were mere shadows". He tells us that there upon the Cross "Christ was the Priest making an oblation of Himself, and, at the same time the victim of His sacrifice". There upon the Cross, he says, Christ was "the one true Mediator, reconciling us with God by a sacrifice of peace. He was One with God to whom He offered there; and He united in one all those for whom He offered there; and He was at one and the same time the offerer and the victim that was offered."⁷

St. John Chrysostom energetically states that Christ "*was offered on the Cross and immolated on the Cross.*" And he repeats with insistence that the sacrifice of Redemption, since it was offered for the whole world, was enacted, not in the temple, nor in a house, nor under any roof.⁸ This last thought was frequently expressed by the Fathers. Thus, e.g., Pope St. Leo in his sermons to the people: "Christ offered the true sacrifice of reconciliation to the Father, not in the temple, nor within the walls of the city, but outside and beyond the city was He crucified, so that, the mystery of the victims of the Old Law having been brought to a close, a new Victim might be placed on a new altar

⁶Cft. particularly Ch. 9-10 of the epistle.

⁷De Trinitate, 4, 13, 7; Enchiridion, 33; De Civitate Dei, 10, 20; De Trinitate, 4, 14.

⁸De Cruce et Latrone.

and the Cross of Christ might become the altar not of the temple but of the whole world".⁹ "You see Jesus taken up on the Cross," says St. Gregory Nazianzen, "you see Him there as a *victim that is offered and as a Priest who offers*". That is the very heart of our Tradition, expressed in that one phrase spoken from generation to generation: "Upon the Cross Christ was the Priest of His victim, and the victim of His Priesthood".

The Fathers teach us; we do not teach the Fathers. We are not at liberty to say to them: No, you neither thought nor spoke correctly in this matter: You see, Christ did not offer a true, complete sacrifice on Calvary at all. The offering (oblation) of the Victim took place within the walls, under a roof, in the supper-room. That was one essential element, but it was not yet a sacrifice. The immolation took place on Calvary. That was the other essential element, but it was not in itself a sacrifice. Only when the two were united as matter and form was the one, complete sacrifice verified!

Having thus corrected the Fathers, one would have to correct the text-books on the tract of the Redemption. For, the various authors of that tract, having stated that sacrifice consists essentially in the oblation of an immolated victim, proceed to formulate substantially this thesis, which they characterize as being *de fide tenenda*: "Christ the priest offered Himself on the altar of the Cross in a true, proper, and most perfect sacrifice".

Surely, that which fulfils *the definition* of a true, complete sacrifice is, in fact, a true and complete sacrifice. But such was the death of Christ on the Cross. It was "the supreme act of worship in which there is offered (oblated) to God a sense-perceptible object which is placed in a state of immolation, in order to signify externally the internal dispositions of soul, by which man acknowledges the infinite excellence of God, and proclaims his total submission to Him". One moment's reflection is sufficient to convince us that Calvary saw that definition perfectly and terribly verified. The *immolation* of the Victim was painfully evident. And the *oblation* of the Victim by Christ, the Priest of the sacrifice, was undeniably present for all to see and hear. All that was required was an *external action* which clearly showed that He was there sacrificing His life to the Eternal Father for the redemption of men. Who can deny that this action was patently given when the Son of Man, having freely delivered Himself into the

⁹Sermo, 59, 5; Cf. Sermo, 68, 3.

hands of His executioners in order to undergo the death that He had so frequently foretold, and having voluntarily stretched out His hands on the altar of the Cross, gave forth His mighty cry: "Father, into Thy hands I commend my Spirit"?

Even Father de la Taille willingly admits that the internal oblation of Christ was manifested externally "by so many and so great actions and words of the Lord right up to the moment of His death".¹⁰ Yes, even if the Priest-Reedemer had not uttered so much as one word during His Passion, still the priestly oblation of Himself would have been abundantly manifested externally in the voluntary acceptance of His fearful sufferings and death. St. Thomas had no doubt on that score. "Christ," he says, "did not kill Himself but He voluntarily exposed Himself to death, as it is written, 'He was offered because He willed it'; and therefore He is said to have offered Himself".¹¹ The Saint assures us that "the passion of Christ was the offering of a sacrifice because Christ, by His own free will, underwent death out of Charity".¹² The Angelic Doctor, faithful witness to our Tradition, never thought of seeking outside the actual Passion of Christ for the priestly oblation of Calvary's sacrifice. "He offered His Body as a victim on the altar of the Cross to God the Father for our reconciliation, and there He poured out His Blood".¹³

We conclude, then, that the sacrifice of the Cross was, of itself and by itself, a true, complete, perfect sacrifice. This is entirely a matter of evidence. And, search as we may, we can find no evidence, whether of Scripture, Tradition, or Council, to support the theory that Christ our Lord enacted only a part-sacrifice in the Cenacle and a part-sacrifice on Calvary, the two coalescing in numerically one sacrifice. All the evidence proclaims that Christ twice fulfilled adequately the true definition of sacrifice: once in the supper-room, where He was sacramentally immolated and oblato to God in a perfect sacramental sacrifice; and again on the Cross, where He was physically and bloodily immolated, and once more oblato in a perfect sacrifice. Those two sacrifices were numerically and adequately distinct.

That is our position. Undoubtedly, some will not find it convincing. Still they will wish to unite the action of the Cenacle with that of the Cross in one numerical sacrifice. Still they will seek to fuse the

¹⁰*Mysterium Fidei*, pp. 102, 103.

¹¹S. Theol. 3, 22, 2, ad 1^{am}.

¹²S. Theol. 3, 47, 4, ad 2^{am}.

¹³*Opusculum* 57; Office of Corpus Christi.

sacramental and the physical orders—which are poles apart—into a homogeneous unity. Let us, then, go to the final court of appeal, the Council of Trent. On 17th September, 1562, the Council, with the intention of defining the Church's doctrine concerning the Sacrifice of the Mass and its relation to the Sacrifice of the Cross, issued its famous Doctrinal Decree. It is a *de fide* document, as all know. The following is an inelegant but literal translation in which the more important words and phrases are emphasised:

“Since there was no perfection under the first Testament, as St. Paul testifies because of the weakness of the Levitical priesthood, it was necessary, in accordance with the will of God the Father of mercy, that another priest *according to the order of Melchisedech* should arise, — Our Lord Jesus Christ, who should perfect all who were to be sanctified, and lead them to a perfect end.

“Therefore, this our God and Lord, *ALTHOUGH* He was about to offer *Himself* once (*etsi semel seipsum oblaturus esset*) on the altar of the Cross, so that by undergoing death He might bring about the eternal redemption of men; *NEVERTHELESS* (because His Priesthood was not to be extinguished by death), *AT THE LAST SUPPER*, on the night in which He was betrayed, in order that He might leave to His beloved spouse, the Church, *A VISIBLE SACRIFICE*, by which *THAT BLOODY SACRIFICE* which was to be performed once on the Cross *WOULD BE REPRESENTED*, and its *MEMORY* remain until the end of the world, and by which the *SALUTARY EFFICACY OF THAT BLOODY SACRIFICE WOULD BE APPLIED* for the forgiveness of those sins which daily we commit.

“Declaring Himself a priest forever *ACCORDING TO THE ORDER OF MELCHISEDECH*, He *OFFERED* (*obtulit*) His Body and Blood *under the species of bread and wine* to God the Father;

“And He gave His Body and Blood, under the species of those same things, to His Apostles, to be eaten; and at the same time He constituted those Apostles priests of the New Covenant; and He commanded those same Apostles, and their successors in the priesthood, to *OFFER* (*ut offerrent*) that Body and Blood, by saying to them: ‘Do this for a commemoration of Me’. This the Catholic Church has always understood and taught.

“For, having celebrated the ancient Pasch, which the multitude of

the children of Israel were accustomed *TO IMMOLATE* in memory of their departure from Egypt, He there instituted *THE NEW PASCH*, namely, *HIMSELF, TO BE IMMOLATED* under visible signs in memory of His passing from this world to the Father".¹⁴

Let each one judge for himself as to whether the Council defined, in this *de fide* Decree, that Christ offered two sacrifices or one only. In our mind there is not the shadow of a doubt that the Council teaches that the sacrificial action of Christ in the supper-room constituted a sacrifice *adequately distinct* from the sacrifice enacted on the Cross. The reasons?

I) The Council manifestly speaks of *two sacrifices*, not of *two parts* of the one sacrifice. The Decree clearly states that Christ, at the Last Supper, instituted a *visible sacrifice* by which *that other, that bloody sacrifice* would be represented and its fruits applied. This would be sheer nonsense if in reality there were not two sacrifices, but only two parts of the one sacrifice.

II) The Council employs two adversative conjunctions which, of their nature, *place an opposition* between the "visible sacrifice" of the Supper and the "Bloody Sacrifice" of the Cross: *ALTHOUGH* He was going to offer Himself in a bloody sacrifice, *NEVERTHELESS* He offered Himself at the Supper in an unbloody sacrifice. How very eccentric we would think a man who said: "*ALTHOUGH* I am about to play a game of golf, *NEVERTHELESS* I have brought my clubs". Why would we think him queer? Simply because the conjunction, "*ALTHOUGH*" is used normally to introduce something which is, or seems to be, an impediment to that which is announced by the *OPPOSED RELATIVE*, "nevertheless". But the having a set of clubs is a natural, essential part of a round of golf, and so we would expect a sensible person to say: "since, or because, I intend to play some golf, I have brought my clubs". Shall we, then, deny to the Fathers of Trent the ordinary degree of common-sense that we expect to find in the average man? Surely if they held that the Supper was only the *oblation* of the Victim that was to be *immolated* on the Cross, and therefore a constitutive, an essential part of the Sacrifice of the Cross, the initiation of a sacrifice to be perfected on Calvary,—if that is what they held, then their wording of the Decree is patently absurd. No! If they really wanted to teach that to the Christian world, they would have

¹⁴Sess., 22, ch. 1; Denzinger 938.

said something like this: "Our Lord, since He was going to be *immolated* bloodily on the altar of the Cross, made the *oblation* of His Body and Blood beforehand, in the supper-room, and directed that oblation to the immolation of the Cross, whereon His One Sacrifice was completed". But the assembled Fathers said no such thing. In fact, they said the opposite. They said that *ALTHOUGH* Christ was going to offer Himself *IN A BLOODY SACRIFICE* on the Cross, *nevertheless* He offered Himself *IN AN UNBLOODY SACRIFICE* at the Supper. And, if words have any value, that certainly means that the Supper was not an essential or integral part of the sacrifice of the Cross, but that it itself was a true, complete sacrifice opposed to, and adequately distinct from, Calvary's sacrifice.

III) This *DUALITY OF SACRIFICE* is also clear from the *OPPOSED CHARACTERISTICS* that are found in the nature and ends of the two sacrifices. The Council teaches that the sacrifice of the Cenacle is opposed to the sacrifice of the Cross, firstly as a representative rite is opposed to that which is represented; secondly, as a memorial is opposed to the object to be perpetually remembered; thirdly, as that which is daily repeated is opposed to that which once only is enacted, never again to be repeated; and fourthly, as that which applies merit to particular individuals is opposed to that which acquired all merits for all men. How can they possibly be two essential parts of the one sacrifice?

IV) It is historically certain that the Fathers of the Council used the term "offer" (*obtulit, oblaturus*) in the broad sense as equivalent to *performing a true sacrifice*, not in the restricted sense of merely *making an oblation*. That is quite evident from the discussions that preceded the formulation of the Decree. The Fathers debated the question as to whether Christ *offered a true sacrifice* at the Supper, and they almost invariably used the term "*obtulit*" (offered) in that sense. That being so, a fundamental law of textual interpretation compels us to admit that the Council, in its Dogmatic Decree, employed the word "*obtulit*" in the full sense of *enacting a true sacrifice*. For, it is inconceivable that the same word should have one meaning in the preliminary discussions, and quite another meaning in the Decree itself. No one could be justified in that conclusion, unless the Council had warned us of a sudden change in its terminology. But no such warning was given. Hence, we are obliged to conclude that the Council definitely

taught that Christ offered two sacrifices, each complete in itself and distinct from the other.¹⁵

V) The main object of the Tridentine Synod was the condemnation of the pestiferous errors of the Reformers. Now, they were proclaiming loudly throughout all Europe that the Mass could not be a true sacrifice because the Apostle had said that Christ had offered Himself but once, "by one oblation..." etc. Consequently, if the Fathers of the Council really held that Christ merely made *the oblation* of Himself at the Supper, not performing a truly complete sacrifice there at all, surely they could, with the utmost facility, have cut the ground from beneath the feet of their adversaries, and opened the door to reconciliation, by simply saying: "Yes, He made an oblation of Himself once only; the former was done in the Cenacle, while the latter was carried out on Calvary; and these two, the Supper and the Cross, are two constituent, essential elements of the one complete sacrifice performed by Christ our Priest-Redeemer". It were so very easy to have said that, if they had really wanted to say it. But say it they did not. No, not even one of them is reported in the Acts of the Council as having said it. They defined, on the contrary, that our Lord, *although* about to offer Himself in a bloody sacrifice on the Cross, *nevertheless* offered Himself beforehand in an unbloody, visible sacrifice. Again we must conclude that Trent solemnly taught that Our Lord offered two complete, distinct sacrifices.¹⁶

Hence, our third assertion is amply justified, and we conclude with the words of the Church-praying: "The love of this, His Sacred Heart,

¹⁵Pallavicini, the historian of the Council, writes: "The selected Fathers had set in order the matters that were more commonly approved concerning the oblation of Christ, contentious matters having been omitted, and they stated, as is now held, that the Redeemer at the Supper *offered Himself in sacrifice* to the Father, under the species of bread and wine; but they did not express *in what kind of sacrifice*". (History of the Council of Trent, Bk. 18, Ch. 5.).

¹⁶Fr. de la Taille and other Unicists, in an attempt to escape from the obvious meaning of the Decree, do not hesitate to resort to these tactics: although the Decree uses precisely the same word (*obtulit, oblaturus*) to express Christ's sacrificial actions at the Supper and on the Cross, they give a very different meaning to the word in each case; for, they understand the word "*oblaturus*" to mean "about to be *immolated*"; and the same word, "*obtulit*," is interpreted as meaning "He made the *oblation* of Himself". Not only is this quite arbitrary, but it is altogether unjustifiable: firstly, because it is evident from the preliminary speeches of the Fathers and theologians that the word "*offerre*" was used in the *integral sense* of enacting a true, complete sacrifice; secondly, because it is a fundamental rule of hermeneutics that when the same word is used in two clauses of a sentence it must be understood to have the same meaning in both clauses, unless a warning to the contrary be given. It is unthinkable that the Council, in this matter of supreme importance, where the greatest precision of terminology was demanded, should have been so careless as to confuse its terms. And it is unworthy of scholarship to imply that it did.

was manifest, when undergoing *both a bloody and an unbloody immolation, both sacrifices did Christ the Priest offer on high*".¹⁷

ASSERTION IV.

The sacrifices of the Supper and the Cross were two specifically different sacrifices; and since the Mass is the same specific sacrifice as that offered in the supper-room, the same must be said of the Mass and the Cross.

The assertion means that the Supper and the Cross were not only numerically distinct sacrifices, each complete in itself, but that there was a formal difference between them. The same is true of the Mass and the Cross.

Once more, there is no difficulty in this statement once we have accepted the great central truth that the Mass is formally constituted a sacrifice by the sacramental, or mystical, immolation of the Victim. That must be our lodestar, lighting our path and bringing us safely through the Scylla and Charybdis. Now, the present assertion follows as a mere corollary of that established truth.

The immolation of the victim is, as we have seen, the formal constituent of sacrifice in general. It is the form which constitutes sacrifice in its species. But, physical—bloody immolation undoubtedly differs specifically from sacramental—unbloody immolation. Therefore we must necessarily admit that the sacrifice of the supper-room, and therefore the sacrifice of the Mass, is a specifically different sacrifice from that of the Cross. The bloody immolation of Calvary's Victim, which was the formal constituent of Calvary's sacrifice, is not had in the sacrifice of the Mass. There we are taught to see quite a different formal constituent, namely, the mystical slaying of the Divine Victim.

Someone may exclaim: but have we not frequently heard it said that "the Mass and the Cross are *one and the same sacrifice*"? Yes, that is said almost as often as the Mass is the theme of pulpit or pious book. But, when the statement is left thus without further explanation, it is as false as it is true. Already it is evident that they are not numerically one and the same sacrifice. And it is equally manifest that,

¹⁷Hymn for Lauds, Feast of the Sacred Heart of Jesus.

if we consider sacrifice in its formal constituent, that is, not the victim, nor the oblation of the victim, but the placing of the victim in a state of immolation, they are not *specifically* one and the same sacrifice.

We shall endeavour to explain in what restricted sense that statement must be held to be true when in our next article we continue this discussion on the Supper, the Cross, and the Mass.

THOMAS MULDOON.

*

*

*

*

SHORT NOTICE.

THE SIN OF ADAM IN THE WRITINGS OF ST. THOMAS AQUINAS.

by Edmund J. Fitzpatrick, St. Mary of the Lake Seminary, Illinois. pgs. 179.

There is no need for the reference to *Radio Replies* to show that the problem of Adam's sin, indeed of any sin, holds great interest to-day. So Fr. Fitzpatrick has an advantage in his subject, and, at least in his way of approach, he makes good use of it. There is no space given to historical details. He is concerned simply with the psychology of Adam's sin as given by St. Thomas. The state of original justice and its effects, particularly those relating to peccability, are carefully examined. To prepare the way for a solution, the saint's general theory of sin is presented, with special regard for the part of the intellect. The problem emphasised all the time is that Adam's perfection of sense, will and intellect seems to imply impeccability, or, if a lapse did come, its only explanation would be a natural, inculpable defect. In the two last chapters the species and occasion of the sin are decided and the solution of St. Thomas is presented at length.

In all this the chronological approach is used. As the authorities agree on the order, if not the dates, of the pertinent works of St. Thomas, this problem receives only a short treatment. Each subsequent point is considered according to the development of St. Thomas' doctrine. A difficulty is found in the final section on the causality of Adam's sin, for this is not discussed in the later works. By considering analogous questions. Fr. Fitzpatrick tries to find what changes would have occurred had it been considered. His conclusion is satisfactory enough, being only the earlier doctrine with a change of emphasis.

The usual features of a thesis for doctorate, great care for detail and lengthy footnotes, are to be found here, but they are pardonable. A more serious defect is dullness of style, which combines with the others to make for very heavy reading.

A bibliography is given whose chief interest lies in the good collection of articles from periodicals.

B.J.

Moral Theology

ANNUAL COMMUNION AND ABSOLUTION FROM RESERVED CASES.

Dear Rev. Sir,

There is a faculty granted to priests to absolve from reserved sins and certain censures during the time *ad Paschale Praeceptum implendum utile*. Does this faculty still remain after the time appointed for the Easter Communion has passed, in the case of one who is still bound to receive the Easter Communion? Is there a distinction between the penitent who could have fulfilled his Easter duty at the proper time, but did not do so, and another who has not had the opportunity?

CAPELLANUS.

REPLY.

We think that the faculty of absolving from reserved cases, which is in some places granted for the time available for the fulfilment of the paschal precept, ceases when the time referred to has expired. Nevertheless, we believe that the case of a person who has not yet made his annual communion will usually be an urgent one, and any confessor will be able to absolve him from reserved sins, since reservation loses its force in such circumstances. (Can. 900, n. 2.) Also, any confessor in an urgent case receives faculties from Law to absolve, in the internal forum, from all censures *latae sententiae*, with the obligation, however, of having recourse within a month to the Sacred Penitentiary or a Superior who enjoys the faculty of absolving from the censures in question (Can. 2254, par. 1.)

A simple confessor has no faculties from the Code to absolve from reserved sins or censures in normal circumstances. Parish Priests and all who come under that designation in Law can absolve from cases which the Ordinary has reserved to himself, during the whole of the period within which the Paschal Precept may be fulfilled, that is, in Australia and New Zealand, from Ash Wednesday to Trinity Sunday, unless the Ordinary, for necessary reasons, prolongs the time to the octave day of the Feast of Saints Peter and Paul (July 6th).¹ This faculty, it must be noted, is restricted to cases reserved by the Ordinary to himself; it does not include those numerous censures which are reserved by the universal Legislator to the Holy See or the Ordinary nor

¹Can. 899, par. 3, and Plenary Council (1937), dec. 383.

the sin (*falsa denunciatio sacerdotis innocentis de crimine sollicitationis*) reserved *ratione sui* to the Holy See: neither does it extend to cases which may be reserved by a Plenary or Provincial Council.

Our correspondent seems to have in mind not so much the faculty granted by Law to one set of confessors—Parish Priests—but those privileges which are frequently given to all priests who are approved to hear confessions in the Diocese. It is not unusual to find that every confessor has the faculty of absolving, by virtue of delegated jurisdiction, from reserved sins and certain reserved censures, during the time set down for the reception of the Paschal Communion (*tempore ad Paschale Praeceptum implendum utili*). Whether such privileges are granted at all, and if so, what is their nature and how far they extend can be ascertained from a reference to the Diocesan Faculty Sheet. Apparently, there are such special faculties available in the Diocese to which Capellanus is attached; and he wishes to know if they are strictly limited to the time set down for the fulfilment of the Paschal Precept or may be used any day of the year, when in fact the penitent has not yet attended to his "Easter duties".

The possession of a delegated faculty depends on the will of the Superior (Ordinary) who can grant it. The Bishop is competent to empower any priest to absolve from sins which he himself has reserved, and also from the cases reserved by the Code over which he has faculties for absolution, either from Law or by Indult from the Holy See. The concession of faculties as well as their extension or limitation to certain persons or particular occasions is subject to the intention of the Ordinary, manifested to the priest who receives them. The question is: how to interpret the phrase *tempore ad paschale praeceptum implendum utili*, if we read it in a Diocesan Faculty Sheet? A phrase, almost identical, occurs in can. 899, par. 3, to which we have referred above when mentioning that Parish Priests, during the time set aside for the Easter Communion, receive faculties from the Code itself to absolve from Episcopal cases. It is reasonable to assume that the words of the Faculty Sheet are borrowed from the Canon, and that the Bishop desires to give to all his priests rather extensive faculties for reserved cases, after the manner in which the supreme Legislator authorises Parish Priests to absolve from cases which the Ordinary has reserved to himself. When we have decided the meaning of the words *tempore ad praeceptum paschale adimplendum utili*, as they occur in can. 899, we shall have solved our problem.

There does not seem to be much doubt that the troublesome phrase signifies a definite space of time; and consequently, when that period has elapsed, the special faculties cease. We may presume that the ultimate reason of the faculty is to facilitate the fulfilment of the Paschal Precept. In obedience to the command of the Church, not a few of those who do not frequently approach the Sacraments, make their peace with God at the Easter season; and they would be perhaps deterred from so doing, should they have to search for a privileged confessor whom they may possibly need. Nevertheless, the Parish Priest enjoys the special faculty as he receives it from Law, namely, to absolve from reserved sins, not because the confession is made *intuitu communionis paschalis*, but simply because it takes place during this particular season. Commentators agree that the Parish Priest may absolve from reserved Episcopal cases, even though the penitent has already received his Easter Communion. It is the season rather than the purpose for which this confession is made, that is the basis of the privilege.²

It might be argued that the reason of the special faculty is to enable the faithful to fulfil the paschal precept, and can. 859, par. 4, states that the precept of the paschal communion still urges, if it be not fulfilled during the prescribed time, for any cause whatsoever. Therefore, the privilege of absolving from reserved cases should be available when a person desires to receive his annual communion, even though he has culpably neglected to do so in the past. At any rate, if through no fault of his own the time appointed for the paschal communion passed and he did not receive the Blessed Eucharist, he should not thereby be penalised. On the other hand, laws are made to meet the circumstances that commonly occur. All are supposed to approach the Holy Table at Easter time, and the Church is very generous in prolonging the period to suit the convenience of the faithful. Those who are actually unable to perform the "Easter duties" are very few and their case seems not to be considered worthy of mention in the general law. Persons who deliberately disobey the law cannot expect preferential treatment at every turn when they finally do make up their minds to return to their duties. For neither class are the privileges of the Easter season extended, though their obligation is not extinguished.

It must not be concluded, however, that these people, if they were

²Neque exigitur ut confessio ad paschale praeceptum implendum fiat. Sed tempus ipsum est privilegiatum, in quo etiam ii qui paschali praecepto iam satisfecerint, absolutionem casuum quos Ordinarius sibi reservaverit a parochis obtinere possunt. Vermeersch-Creusen, *Epitome Iuris Canonici*, Tom. II., n. 180.

unfortunate enough to fall into a sin which is reserved or to incur a reserved censure, are to be left in their state of misery. Other provision has been made for them, as we have already indicated. If they are so repentant that it is too much for them to remain in the state of sin, or if sending them away without absolution would be the occasion of loss of good name or of scandal, they can be immediately absolved from all sins, and from censures incurred *ipso facto*. There remains, however, the obligation, in the case of reserved censures, to have recourse to the S. Penitentiary or an Ordinary who has the faculty of absolving from the censure in question, in order to receive suitable advice and admonition. It would be sufficient to submit anew the sin to which the censure was attached to a confessor who has the privilege of absolving from it, provided this is done within a month.

We may note in conclusion that many Diocesan Faculty Sheets grant to all confessors the faculty to absolve from reserved sins and from censures reserved to the Holy See *speciali modo* or *simpliciter* when the penitent makes a general confession. With a few discreet questions, the confessor should have no difficulty in eliciting a general confession, and so verify the condition under which he will receive the delegation to absolve from practically every case he is likely to meet. It must be stressed, however, that the Code does not supply jurisdiction for reserved cases when a general confession is made. If such provision has been made, it is due to the positive wish of the Bishop and will be explicitly set down in the Diocesan Faculty Sheet.

*

*

*

*

LAWFULNESS OF CONSENT OF PARENT TO MARRIAGE OF MINOR.

Dear Rev. Sir,

A widowed Catholic mother discovers that her daughter, aged eighteen years, intends to marry a non-Catholic. At the suggestion of the mother, the young man interviews a priest; but as it was obvious that he had no intention of respecting any pre-nuptial guarantees, the priest refused to have any more to do with him. The mother at first refused to give the consent for the marriage which is required by civil law, as she knew the ceremony would take place in a Protestant church. At last, her resistance was broken by the behaviour of the daughter who was impossible to live with, and she signed the necessary legal

document, which did not specify the place of marriage. Did the mother do wrong in signing this document?

QUONDAM DISCIPULUS.

REPLY.

The only excuse we can find for the unhappy mother is that she may have been so distracted by the conduct of her daughter that she did not realise the full import of her action in giving permission for what she well knew would be an unlawful matrimonial union. Her one desire seems to have been to find relief at all costs from the taunts of the unruly girl, but the means employed to secure domestic peace were not justified.

The consent of the mother was co-operation in the sin of her daughter. It was not necessarily formal co-operation. The same legal form would have had to be signed if the marriage took place in the presence of the parish priest; so that the act of giving the consent to the marriage of daughter was in itself indifferent. Moreover, we can assume that the mother did not really agree to the marriage in the non-Catholic church. It is also possible that the required legal consent could have been obtained otherwise, if the civil authorities, with whom Religion is a matter of private concern, considered the mother's objections unreasonable. But in actual fact, the consent of the mother did make the non-Catholic marriage a certain eventuality, and it was known that such would be the case. The celebration of a marriage ceremony of any description was consequent on the consent of the mother; the fact that it took place in the Protestant church we may ascribe to the malice of the daughter. The mother's co-operation was therefore material, but it was also sinful. We are justified in bringing about a set of circumstances which we foresee another will use as a means to commit sin, only when we have a sufficiently grave cause; and it is difficult to imagine a cause which would permit a mother to make it possible for her eighteen year daughter to contract an invalid marriage, which is sure to bring in its train practical loss of the faith and untold misery, if not in this life, most likely in the next. The objective sinfulness of the mother's act becomes greater when we consider that as the natural guardian of her daughter she is bound by the virtue of parental piety to protect and defend her child from evil. Instead of doing this, she has opened the way to a life of sin. We fail to see how one could establish even a probability in favour of the lawfulness of the mother's legal consent.

ENCLOSURE OF NUNS.

Dear Rev. Sir,

Not a little has been said and written lately about new Regulations governing the enclosure of Nuns. I feel sure that a few lines in the *RECORD* would be interesting.

CUSTOS.

REPLY.

Our correspondent has in mind the Apostolic Constitution, "*Sponsa Christi* Ecclesia", of Pope Pius XII, given on 21st November, 1950, and an Instruction of the S. Congregation of Religious which implements the Papal Constitution, and was signed two days later by the Cardinal Prefect of that S. Congregation. Both documents are of great importance with regard to the organisation, the scope and apostolic activities that may be undertaken by Orders of Nuns. It must be understood that there is question only of Nuns; and as almost all the Religious women to be found in Australia are not Nuns but Sisters, what we have to say will have little practical importance, though it will doubtless be interesting to the Clergy and Religious of both sexes. We shall endeavour to put the matter briefly and as clearly as possible.

1. By the enclosure in general is meant a portion of the Religious house which is reserved for the exclusive use of the members of the Institute. In this sense the houses even of the Congregations of both men and women are subject to some enclosure. The least strict form of enclosure forbids the entry of persons of the other sex, without just and reasonable motives and with the permission of the superior. All Congregations are bound by this law of enclosure: there is no *ipso facto* punishment for its violation, but the Ordinary is empowered, in particular circumstances and for grave reasons, to inflict censures to enforce its observance; and he is enjoined to ensure that it is kept and that no abuses are allowed to arise. Though not specifically so called in the Code, this enclosure is often known as Episcopal. Papal enclosure is stricter and is imposed by Law on all houses of Regulars, that is those who have solemn vows. In the case of Orders of men, the entry of women into the enclosure is absolutely forbidden, except with permission of the Holy See and in the instances mentioned in the Law; but the Religious themselves are under no prohibition with regard to coming out of the enclosure. Nuns with solemn vows must not leave the cloister and entry, speaking generally, is forbidden to all externs, male

or female, clerical or lay. The violation of Papal enclosure is punished by excommunication reserved to the Holy See (*simpliciter*).

2. The Apostolic Constitution *Sponsa Christi* has modified somewhat the existing Law on the enclosure of Nuns:—

a) All Nuns are now subject to Papal enclosure. By Nuns in the sense of can. 488, n. 7, are to be understood: Religious women with solemn vows, and also, unless from the nature of the case or the context of the law, it is otherwise apparent, those Religious women whose vows should be solemn according to the rules of their Institute, although in some places by reason of Apostolic permission, they actually take vows that are simple. A Religious woman is called a Nun if she belongs to an Institute in which the approved Constitutions prescribe solemn vows. If that prescription of the Constitution has been fulfilled, she is a Regular. If the vows taken are not solemn, but by provision of the Holy See only simple vows, she is still truly a Nun and not a Sister; but she is not a Regular. Hitherto, the convents of Nuns where solemn vows were actually taken, that is the convents of Regulars, were bound by the Papal enclosure; the convents in which the Nuns made simple profession had common or Episcopal enclosure, and the violation of their cloister, although forbidden, did not entail any excommunication. We repeat that all Nuns are now subject to Papal enclosure.

b) The Law of the Code provided for only one form of Papal enclosure. The cloister included all that part of the house inhabited by the community, with its garden and orchards, except the church with the adjoining sacristies, the guest rooms, and the parlor; this latter should be situated, as far as possible, near the entrance of the house. (Can. 597, par. 2).

The Constitution *Sponsa Christi* distinguishes two forms of enclosure, major and minor. The major enclosure is that of the Code; it extends to the whole convent area mentioned above, and forbids entry to externs as well as egress to the Nuns, under pain of excommunication. The minor enclosure likewise covers the entire convent area, but does not extend with the same exclusiveness to every part of the establishment. The portion which is reserved for the use of the Religious community is closed against the entry of externs in the same manner as the whole convent is forbidden to them where the major enclosure is in force, and under the same penalty of excommunication. Another part of the convent is set aside for the exercise of the works of the apostolate, v.g., teaching and various forms of educational activities, and may be

entered freely by those who are the recipients of the ministrations of the Religious and by women who need to have access because of their part in the work in which the Nuns are engaged. Such, it seems, would be ladies who act as assistant mistresses, female servants who attend to the cleaning of the school, etc. The Ordinary is also empowered to declare, once and for all, that certain persons, as inspectors of schools and government officials, have habitual authorisation to go into this portion of the Religious house in the exercise of their official duties; and in cases not covered either by the permission of the Law or the declaration of the Ordinary special permission may be obtained from him. Violations of this lesser cloister can be punished by the Ordinary with penalties proportionate to the gravity of the crime.

With regard to leaving the convent precincts: The Nuns may not go beyond the boundary of the entire Institution, under pain of excommunication, without permission of the Holy See, except to avoid grave and imminent danger. They are not allowed to pass the line of demarcation between the section of the convent reserved for the community and the other part, where the works of religion or charity are attended to, without permission of the Superior. A Nun who offends against this regulation may be punished either by the Superior or the Ordinary.

We may briefly describe the effects of the new legislation which introduces the notion of minor enclosure as twofold: The first effect is that many Nuns who were formerly bound only by common or Episcopal enclosure, because they did not take solemn vows, are now subject to Papal enclosure and the penalties for its violation. The second effect is that where minor enclosure is imposed only portion of the convent area is closed against all externs, and the whole area is in some sense open to the Nuns. There is thus a common portion where some externs are authorised to enter without prohibition, and to which the Nuns can have access with the permission of their Superior. Should unauthorised persons or Nuns without due permission come into this section of the convent buildings or property they are guilty of sin and are liable to be punished with ecclesiastical penalties, but they do not incur the excommunication laid down in the Code against those who violate the enclosure.

c) The major enclosure now has its juridical reason not in the fact of solemn profession—because the house is a convent of Regulars—but in the scope of the Institute. This strict form of enclosure is for Nuns who are devoted exclusively to a life of contemplation. Such

nuns, if they make solemn profession *must* have the major enclosure; if they take only simple vows with the approval of the Holy See, they *may* adopt the major enclosure, but are free to have only the minor cloister.

The minor enclosure is to be adopted by Nuns who engage in some active work of the Apostolate, either according to the purpose of their foundation or with the approval of the Holy See. This applies irrespective of whether they have solemn or simple vows. As has been remarked, all Nuns, even those with simple vows, no matter what be their scope or manner of seeking perfection, must have at least this modified form of enclosure. If such is not possible, the Holy See will make provision and so arrange that they will be classed in future as Religious Congregations and not Orders.

There are many other interesting matters concerning Nuns in the Apostolic Constitution and the Instruction of the S. Congregation of Religious. Our readers will find further information in the Official Documents section of this issue.

*

*

*

*

QUESTIONS CONCERNING EXTREME UNCTION.

Dear Rev. Sir,

1. Is the anointing of one organ of sense (e.g., the mouth) with the form appropriate to that particular sense, sufficient for the valid administration of the Sacrament of Extreme Unction?

2. If the answer is in the negative, how many senses must be anointed, using the form appropriate to each, to ensure that the Sacrament is valid?

3. If on the day following administration of the Sacrament, the priest has a positive doubt in regard to the anointing of one of the senses, v.g., the mouth, what is he bound to do? Can he merely supply the anointing which was omitted without any further prayers, or must he repeat the whole rite?

VIACARIUS.

REPLY.

1. The anointing of one sense with the particular form for that sense, v.g., *Per istam sanctam unctionem...quidquid per gustum et locutionem deliquisti*, would, we think, be of very doubtful validity. The proximate matter of the Sacrament of Extreme Unction is the anointing of the body of the sick man, as we learn from the words of St. James (5/14). According to the testimony of antiquity, different

customs have existed at various times in both East and West with regard to the portions of the body to be anointed. The older editions of the Roman Ritual (Tit. V., cap. 1, n. 15) contained a rubric directing that the feet and loins be anointed; but the anointing of the loins was to be omitted always in the case of women for the sake of modesty, and also when the sick person was a man, if he could not conveniently be moved. Since the promulgation of the Code and according to the new Ritual (Tit. V., cap. 1, n. 16), the anointing of the feet may be omitted for any reasonable cause, while the loins must never be anointed. It is clear then, even from what has been determined by the Church in our own day, that Our Lord, when instituting this Sacrament, did not specifically determine what parts of the body were to receive the anointings. The significance of the Sacrament was complete as long as sufficient was done to justify the statement that one was anointed, i.e., smeared or rubbed with oil. Theologians disputed and argued whether the five senses should be anointed or whether one would suffice, for the validity of the Sacrament. That controversy is now decided. The Holy Office issued a decree, with the approval of Pope B. Pius X, on 25th April, 1906: In case of real necessity it is sufficient to use the form *Per istam sanctam unctionem indulgeat tibi Dominus quidquid deliquisti. Amen*". The decree directly concerned the form, but the single form supposed only one anointing. Some years later (9th March, 1917), the Holy Office declared that when the necessity was no longer urging, the anointings previously omitted were to be supplied not conditionally but absolutely. To supply the anointings conditionally would suppose that the first and single anointing was only of doubtful validity; while the imposing of an obligation to do them absolutely expresses the mind of the Church that they are merely for the integrity of an act that is already valid. It is sinful to omit them, but in any case the sick person has already received the essential effects of the Sacrament. The doctrine underlying these decrees of the Holy Office is incorporated in can. 957, par. 1, of the Code: "In case of necessity, one anointing of one sense, or more correctly of the forehead is sufficient with the prescribed shorter form". The validity of a sacrament does not depend on the presence of what is called necessity, its rests on the placing of the sacramental sign instituted by Christ. What is lawful in cases of necessity is always valid, though apart from necessity it may be seriously sinful.

One anointing of one of the senses is certainly valid matter of the

Sacrament, provided of course that it is accompanied by the form that makes it signify the anointing of the person. The canon just cited made reference to the shorter form, which does not mention any particular sense, but is universal in its meaning (*quidquid deliquisti*). A sick man who was anointed on the eyes with this form would, we hold as certain, be validly anointed; but if same sense were to be anointed with the words: *quidquid per visum deliquisti*, the rite is a partial anointing only, and signifies no more than the remission of faults (and their consequences) that were committed through the abuse of the particular faculty of sight. Joined with the anointings and the appropriate words referring to the other senses, it would signify that the man himself was anointed, and so the various anointings and prayers taken together make up the complete sacramental sign and a valid sacrament.

The opinion, then, which holds that one anointing with a particular form is a valid sacrament does not seem to us as intrinsically probable. A fundamental principle in sacramental theology is: *Sacramenta efficiunt quod significant*, and the rite must be morally considered an anointing of the whole man, not merely of one of his senses.

2. It is difficult to be definite how many anointings of particular senses would, taken together, constitute a valid sacrament. We would venture an opinion that three of the five (eyes, ears, nostrils, mouth and hands), that are prescribed of obligation outside cases of necessity, would be valid. Certainly, we would say, that the omission of only one anointing would not invalidate the sacrament.

3. There would be an obligation, it seems, to supply any anointings that were not duly given, provided there was still a moral unity between them all. This would follow from the fact that the Code (can. 947, p. 1.) prescribes that the omitted anointings be supplied after the short form has been used in case of necessity. Even though the Sacrament is already valid, the sick man is not to be deprived of the helps which are attached to the single anointings which more perfectly bring out the significance of the rite.

It is not easy to determine when there is a moral union between the various anointings. Genicot-Salmans (Theol. Moral., 1946, vol. 2, n. 417) have the opinion that after a notable period of time, say an hour, there is no longer a moral union between the anointings which were given at first and those afterwards supplied. The Code, however, does not determine the question, but is content to enjoin the obligation *cessante periculo*. There must be some external circumstance to unite

the various acts of the sacramental rite into a moral unity proper to a single sign. It is not improbable that the danger of death which still continues would be sufficient. The priest takes up again the prayer of faith and the anointing with oil which was interrupted, but is now resumed on behalf of the same sick man. (Cf. Vermeersch-Creusen. *Epitome Iuris Canonici*, 1927, Tom. II, n. 231). The subsequent anointings are not without benefit to the invalid, and so there is no reason why they should not be supplied, as long as the same danger of death continues. Practically, we would say that there is surely an obligation to supply what has been omitted, when only one sense or the forehead has been anointed, if it can be done within about an hour; the anointings may be supplied any time until the patient either dies or has recovered to the extent that he is not longer in danger of dying. The same we hold to be true if one or perhaps two of the single anointings were omitted or done invalidly outside "the case of necessity". If only one or two of the anointings were given or were valid, it seems that the whole rite would have to be repeated conditionally, if a considerable time had elapsed in the meanwhile. The first attempt to administer the Sacrament was of very doubtful validity, so that what is afterwards done is likely not merely making up for what was lacking to integrity but conferring the essentials of the Sacrament. It is not lawful, even though it be admitted to be valid, to leave out some of the anointings that are prescribed, and hence the statement that the whole rite should be repeated. But because there is some extrinsic probability that the previous anointing was valid, it seems that the Sacrament is to be repeated in its entirety *sub conditione*.

To answer our correspondent's question: What should be done if next day the Priest has a positive doubt that he had not correctly anointed, v.g., the mouth? The Sacrament was valid, since all the other anointings were performed. He may supply the missing anointing conditionally—because he is not certain but doubtful that it was not already validly performed. He is not bound to do so, because of the length of time that has elapsed and the probable lack of moral unity. He can safely apply the principle: *omne factum praesumitur recte factum*, and be content.

JAMES MADDEN.

Canon Law

I. MARRIAGE OF FORMER ANGLICAN RELIGIOUS.

Dear Reverend Sir,

The case which I wish to submit to your judgment is that of a convert, who was formerly an Anglican missionary, a member of an Anglican religious congregation, in which she pronounced vows of poverty, chastity and obedience.

Someone has raised the question as to whether or not these vows are still binding. If they are, what effect have they upon the validity of the marriage? It seems that she considered her vows to have been cancelled automatically by her reception into the Church. Would this be true?

PETER.

REPLY.

There is no doubt that the marriage in question is valid. To decide whether or not the obligations of the vows are still in force, the situation needs to be examined in greater detail.

If the vows were taken for a period which has lapsed, it stands to reason that they are no longer in force. If, however, the vows were perpetual, it must be taken for granted that they are still binding on the subject, unless she has been dispensed in some canonical manner. A vow is defined as "a deliberate and free promise made to God of a good which is possible and better, the obligation being based on the virtue of religion" (Canon 1307, 1). All persons who have a sufficient use of reason are capable of making a vow, unless they are forbidden to do so by law (Canon 1307, 2). Therefore, regardless of whether or not a person is a member of the true Church, provided that he has sufficient use of reason and is acting as a free agent, there is no reason why his vow should not be binding in conscience. Further baptised non-Catholics generally are bound by the laws of the Church, unless they are explicitly exempted. To make a simple comparison, the non-Catholic person in question was just as capable of making valid vows as a non-Catholic is capable of contracting a valid marriage.

In Canonical terminology a *public* vow is one which is accepted by the legitimate ecclesiastical superior in the name of the Church. Otherwise it is *private*. The authority which in good faith accepted the vows of the person in question was not empowered by the Church to receive

vows in the Church's name. Therefore, these vows must be accounted as private vows. Therefore, it will be a simpler matter to obtain a dispensation from them. As far as the vows of poverty and obedience are concerned, the local Ordinary may dispense from these. The position is somewhat different in regard to the vow of chastity, because a vow of perfect and perpetual chastity, if made absolutely and after the age of eighteen, is reserved to the Holy See (Canon 1309). However, by virtue of the faculties of *Formula Maior*, our Ordinaries have the power to dispense, for a just cause, from private vows which are reserved to the Holy See.

As far as the marriage is concerned, it should be recalled that a private vow of chastity is not an invalidating or diriment impediment. It is a prohibiting impediment; so that, the marriage contracted, notwithstanding the existence of this impediment, was not invalid, but unlawful.

* * * *

II. MIXED MARRIAGE CONTRACTED BEFORE WITNESSES ONLY.

Dear Reverend Sir,

In a district where there is no resident priest a Catholic and a Protestant have taken advantage of the law which permits their marriage before witnesses only. They were married in the presence of the civil Registrar. However, the Catholic party understood clearly, by reason of previous instruction, that in the circumstances he was permitted by Canon Law to be married without the presence of a priest; for in view of the programme of travel usually carried out by the much-travelled priest of that area, it was foreseen easily that there would not be a priest available for two months.

To approach the parish priest, or Ordinary, or a priest delegated by either of them, would have constituted a grave hardship.

My difficulty lies in the fact that this was a mixed marriage. Verbally they exchanged the undertakings which are required before a dispensation from mixed religion is granted. However, I am faced with the clear terms of Canon 2375: "Catholics who dare to contract a mixed marriage, even though it be valid, without a dispensation from the Church, are ipso facto barred from legitimate ecclesiastical acts and from the sacramentals, until they shall have obtained a dispensation from the Ordinary."

PAUL.

REPLY.

By applying general rules concerning the imputability of a crime, it would appear that the man in question would not incur the penalties of Canon 2375. When it is a question of penal laws which are merely ecclesiastical, serious inconvenience, generally speaking, removes the crime altogether. This is not the case when there is question of an act which is intrinsically evil, or of an act which implies contempt of the faith or of ecclesiastical authority, or of an act which involves injury to souls (Canon 2205, 2, 3). In the circumstances under consideration there would appear to have been serious inconvenience in waiting for a dispensation. If that is so, no crime has been committed, and the penalty in question has not been incurred. The marriage was lawful, not only in spite of its being contracted before witnesses only, but also in spite of the fact that it was contracted without any dispensation from the impediment of mixed religion.

JOHN.

* * * *

III. MAY CONVENT CHAPLAIN BE ORDINARY
CONFESSOR TO THE COMMUNITY?

Dear Reverend Sir,

I am a chaplain to a community of nuns. I have been asked to accept the office of ordinary confessor. As far as I remember the law, I am not eligible to accept this position because it is unlawful to mingle duties of the external and the internal forum. Would you kindly offer guidance?

JOSEPH.

REPLY.

It is quite possible that the office of Chaplain would not preclude one's assuming the duties of ordinary confessor. It may be quite another question to judge the advisability of combining these two functions.

Confessors, ordinary or extraordinary, should have no authority in the external forum over the religious whose confessions they are to hear, nor should they interfere in any way with the internal or external government of the community (Canon 524). In many cases the duties of a Chaplain do not include any exercise of external jurisdiction; so that, there is no canonical bar to his assuming the office of ordinary confessor. It will be a matter for prudent judgment to determine whether, in the circumstances of a particular case, it is advisable for both offices to be discharged by the same priest.

IV. NON-CATHOLIC'S MARRIAGE CONTRACTED WITHOUT VALID CIVIL FORM.

Dear Reverend Sir,

Recently I received an Anglican into the Church. He has explained a certain circumstance of the celebration of his marriage which leads me to wonder whether there is any need to seek a rectification of his marriage.

As an Anglican, he was married in the Church of England. However, it transpired subsequently that the Minister who performed the ceremony, owing to some oversight, had not been registered for assistance at marriages by the State's Registrar General. He has been advised that, strictly speaking, his marriage is not valid in Civil Law, and he has been informed also that the attitude of the Church of England would be to uphold the provisions of civil law in this regard. In order to assure canonical validity, should I arrange for the rectification of the marriage?

PASTOR.

REPLY.

Whatever about the implications in civil law, it may be concluded safely that, canonically, the marriage in question is not invalid by reason of the circumstance explained above. It is assumed that, as an Anglican, he was baptised validly in the Church of England.

It would be a different question if the marriage was between two unbaptised persons. There is general agreement amongst authorities in Canon Law that the secular authority is qualified to make laws, even invalidating laws, concerning the marriages of unbaptised persons. It may determine diriment impediments provided that nothing contrary to the natural law or positive Divine law is enacted. Likewise, it may require a certain external form for validity. Non-observance of this form would render the marriage invalid, not only insofar as its civil effects are concerned, but also insofar as the bond itself is in question. It is reasoned that as unbaptised persons are not subjects of the law of the Church, their marriage would be regulated by no authority whatever, with consequent detriment to public order, unless it were within the scope of a civil authority to intervene. In the *Fontes* of the Code there is included a decision by the Congregation of Propaganda of 1820, concerning the marriage of infidels, in which the ceremony prescribed for validity by the civil law had not been observed. Application had been made for the use of the Pauline Privilege, but it was explained in the

decision of Propaganda that there was no necessity to employ the Pauline Privilege, seeing that the parties were already free to marry on account of the invalidity of the union.

The case is different, of course, when there is question of baptised non-Catholics of the Western Church. For the Church has an exclusive right to legislate in regard to the substance of their marriages, the State being competent to legislate only insofar as the civil effects of the marriages of baptised persons are concerned. This principle is enunciated very clearly in the Code: "The marriage of baptised persons is governed not only by Divine law, but also by Canon law, without prejudice to the competency of the civil power as regards the merely civil effects of such marriage." (Canon 1016.) "The same Supreme Authority (the supreme authority of the Church) has the exclusive right to establish for baptised persons impedient or diriment impediments, either by way of general or particular law". (Canon 1038, 1.) By implication, the same claim of the Church's exclusive authority is made in those laws which exempt baptised non-Catholics from observing certain canonical provisions, for example, the Canonical form, or the law which determines the limits of the impediment of disparity of cult.

Therefore, insofar as the form of their marriage is concerned, baptised non-Catholics are not bound to any specific external form, either the Canonical form from which they are exempted expressly, or the form required by the civil authority, which is not competent to legislate in regard to the substance of their marriages. As regards the form of their marriage, they are in just the same position as Catholics were prior to the Decree "Tametsi," of the Council of Trent. The extract from the register of a non-Catholic Church, or from the civil register, is accepted as proof of marriage of non-Catholics. This practice obtains even in ecclesiastical courts. This does not imply any recognition that the religious form or civil form was required for valid celebration of the marriage. The record merely establishes the external manifestation of consent on the part of the parties in question.

To sum up, the baptised Anglican of this case is presumed to have given true matrimonial consent, manifested externally. Therefore, regardless of the civil qualifications of the Minister who witnessed his giving of consent, his marriage is valid before God. There is no need to perform any ceremony of rectification.

JAMES CARROLL.

Liturgy

PRONUNCIATION OF *BLESSED* IN DIVINE PRAISES.

Dear Rev. Sir,

1. Should the word blessed in the Divine Praises be pronounced as a monosyllable or a dissyllable? It appears to me that both forms are commonly used and I have heard that authorities are divided as to the more correct form.

2. In reference to the reply in the October issue of the *A.C.R.* concerning the tone of voice at Mass, if a priest is saying Mass at the high altar for a congregation of people has he to worry about disturbing the priest saying Mass privately at a side altar?

NEOMYSTA.

REPLY.

1. The Oxford English Dictionary says that the past tense and the past participle of the verb *bless* 'are now generally spelt *blessed*, though always pronounced (blest) in modern prose; the past participle may be pronounced (bless-ed) in verse, or liturgical reading'. It will not be out of place to reproduce the remarks of the late Archbishop Sheehan on this same point, as published in the *A.C.R.* (1929, p. 79): 'In the divine praises at Benediction, should we say, "Bless-ed be God" (two syllables) or "Blest be God" (one syllable)? We should say "Blest be God" (one syllable) even though the word be printed as "blessed". Would you say that a man was well "dress-ed"? If not, then you should not say "Bless-ed be God", which is only the inverted form of "God be blessed", where the word is a monosyllable. Likewise, in the "Hail Mary", the word should be pronounced "blest", not "bless-ed". If you look up the dictionaries, you will find that some state simply that "bless-ed" is archaic for "blest", while others add that "bless-ed" is a liturgical pronunciation. But what is meant by "a liturgical pronunciation"? Merely this, that it is an out-of-date pronunciation to which Protestant ministers adhere in their services.

Is there then no such word as "bless-ed"? Yes; "bless-ed" is an adjective, e.g., "The Bless-ed Virgin", "Bless-ed Michael the Archangel", etc. "Blest" corresponds to the past participle, "benedictus", while "bless-ed" is an adjective translating "beatus"...it is correct to say "Blessed is the womb that bore Thee", "Blessed is the man that fears the Lord", where the word represents "Beatus".

2. In the circumstances mentioned it would seem that the Mass being celebrated on the high altar, for the benefit of the congregation assisting at it, takes precedence over the private Mass at the side altar, and consequently the priest at the high altar should not recite the appropriate parts of the Mass 'so low that those present cannot hear'.

* * * *

NECESSITY OF CRUCIFIX ON THE ALTAR.

Dear Rev. Sir,

The altar of my church stands immediately below a large stained glass window of the Crucifixion. The foot of the figure on the cross is a little above the tabernacle, and no other figures are represented. Is it necessary, according to the rubrics, to use another crucifix on the altar for Mass?

SOLITARIUS.

REPLY.

The rubrics require that, during the celebration of Mass, there should be on the altar a cross with an image of the Crucified. The cross ought always be of such dimensions that it can be seen not only by the celebrant but also by the people (*S.R.C.*, D. 2621, 7). If, however, there is a large statue or painting of the Crucifixion above the altar, it is not necessary to have a cross on the altar (D. 1270). A window, such as the one described by our correspondent, appears to be the equivalent of a painting. A difficulty might arise if there is not sufficient daylight to make the painting on the window visible, in which case, of course, a cross would have to be supplied. Were this situation to occur frequently, for example during the winter months, it might be advisable to have a cross permanently on the altar.

* * * *

PUBLIC DEVOTIONS OF STATIONS OF THE CROSS IN CHURCHES AND ORATORIES.

Dear Rev. Sir,

Our church is a very large one, with the result that during the public Stations of the Cross it is very difficult for the congregation to hear the priest reading the prayers as he passes to each station. Would it be permissible, then, for the priest to remain in the pulpit, where he can use the microphone, while the cross-bearer and acolytes move around the stations? A reply in the *A.C.R.* would be appreciated.

PASTOR.

REPLY.

Movement from one station to another is normally required for the gaining of the indulgences attached to the devotion of the Stations of the Cross. But the Church has approved another method which may be used in churches when the devotion is made publicly, and when it would not be practicable for the congregation to move around the stations. The method, proposed by St. Leonard of Port Maurice, is for the priest, accompanied by two acolytes, to move around the stations, while the congregation remain in their places and join with the priest in the recitation of the customary prayers. Authors generally admit that, if, on account of the size of the church or for some other reason, the priest who recites the prayers cannot be heard, then, he may recite the prayers from the pulpit or from some other convenient place, while another priest, accompanied by the acolytes, makes the rounds of the individual stations (cfr. de Angelis, *De indulgentiis*, p. 227). In order that the people might gain the indulgences, it is not sufficient for one priest to conduct the devotion from the pulpit.

A decree of the Sacred Penitentiary, 20th March, 1946, laid it down that the above method of St. Leonard, of Port Maurice, could be used only in churches or public oratories. The same decree gives directions for semi-public oratories. In oratories of religious communities of either men or women, when it is not possible for all the religious to move around the stations at the same time, all the indulgences attached to the devotion may be gained if one of the religious, either man or woman as the case may be, goes around the stations and reads the customary prayers at each one, while the rest of the community remain in their places, and genuflect at each station. This usage is also extended to those persons mentioned in Canon 929, namely, the faithful of both sexes, who lead a life in common, either as religious or as inmates of an institution, a place of study, or a hospital, provided that there is no church or public oratory attached to the house and that it has been established with the consent of the Ordinary. It is clear from these instructions that, in semi-public oratories of the abovementioned communities, the indulgences attached to the Stations of the Cross may be gained by their public recitation only when the prayers are recited by a member of the community. So, for example, the indulgences would not be gained, either by the priest or by the community, if the exercise was conducted by a priest for a community of brothers or sisters.

THE PUNCTUATION OF THE PREFACE OF THE MASS.

In a recent number of the *Ephemerides Liturgicae* (LXV, 1951, pp. 101-104, Dom Juglar, O.S.B. discusses the question of the punctuation of the introductory formula of the Preface of the Mass. As found in the Missal the punctuation is: Domine sancte, Pater omnipotens, aeterne Deus. Dom Juglar contends that the more probably correct form should be: Domine, sancte Pater, omnipotens aeterne Deus.

It is useless to look for evidence in the early manuscripts as punctuation marks did not appear in manuscripts before the 9th century, and then only very irregularly until the 16th century, when the first printed texts made their appearance. The earliest printed missals contain the present punctuation.

From the viewpoint of rhetoric the present form is not nearly as elegant as the form proposed. More impressive is the argument adduced from the comparison of the text of the Preface with other liturgical texts in which the same combination of nouns and adjectives is found. The prayer for the offering of the host has a practically identical formula: Suscipe, sancte Pater, omnipotens aeterne Deus. There can be no doubt concerning the connection between 'sancte' and 'Pater'. The *Exsultet* contains this same invocation 'sancte Pater': Suscipe, sancte Pater, incensi huius sacrificium. The word 'Domine' is never used with an adjective, except in the formula of the Preface, whereas we frequently find the combination 'omnipotens aeterne Deus'.

To these extrinsic arguments Dom Juglar adds some intrinsic arguments from the attribution of certain adjectives to nouns. The word 'Dominus' does not admit an attributive adjective since it is the transcription of Adonai, which replaced the name of Jahve Himself. This, too, is the universal usage of the liturgical texts. On the other hand, 'sancte' is readily attributed to 'Pater'. Our Lord used it in the sacerdotal prayer of the Last Supper: 'Sancte Pater, serva eos in nomine tuo' (John 17, 11). This form recalls also the second petition of the Lord's Prayer: 'Sanctificetur nomen tuum'. The adjectives, 'omnipotens, aeterne' are fittingly attributed to 'Deus', describing as they do the proper attributes of God, omnipotence and eternity.

These arguments of Dom Juglar suffice to show that the proposed form of punctuation of the formula is not without weight, and, in fact, he adds in a concluding note to the article that the proposed form has been adopted in the Preface of the Blessing of the Font in the official edition of the new rite for the Easter Vigil.

P. L. MURPHY.

Homiletics

UNION WITH CHRIST

Few truths of our christian faith are more inspiring than that which teaches us that a Christian is not simply one who accepts the teaching of Jesus Christ, but rather one who is united to Christ, by a union that is real and supernatural. This union with Christ is the very basis of the teaching of the Apostle St. Paul, who sought to illustrate the union by comparing it to the unity that exists between the head and members of the human body. We are the members of the Body of which Christ is the Head. But our Divine Saviour Himself chose an image, which is no less impressive, to explain to His disciples the nature of their relationship with Him. 'I am the true vine, you are its branches'.

St. John sets forth the circumstances of this teaching in the 15th chapter of his Gospel. On the eve of His death Christ told His disciples of the fate that awaited Him on the following day. The hearts of His hearers were filled with sadness, and in order to lessen their sorrow, Jesus then assured them that though the visible union which had existed between Himself and them for the past years was coming to an end, nevertheless, there would still remain a living union between them, which His approaching death could neither interrupt or destroy. The comparison He chose to explain this doctrine was topical. Palestine was a land with extensive vineyards and the disciples would be familiar with the methods employed in cultivating the vines. Furthermore the image of the vine had been previously used in the sacred books of the Old Testament, to describe the relations of God to His Chosen people.

Turning to the parable as it came from the lips of Christ. 'I am the true vine, and it is my Father who tends it. The branch that yields no fruit in me, He cuts away; the branch that does yield fruit, He trims clean, so that it may yield more fruit'. Christ is the *true* vine, for the union between Christ and His followers, being a spiritual union, is more perfect even, than the natural and material unity that exists between the branches and the vine. The human nature of Christ is the bond which links us to Him, and enables us to become sharers in the supernatural life that flows from His divine nature. We are the branches that derive their vitality from the true vine, Jesus Christ. Our heavenly Father is the husbandman who tends the vine. The way in

which He treats the individual branches is described in detail. The useless branches that bear no fruit are cut away and allowed to wither and die on the ground, to be gathered later and thrown into the fire. But the good branches, too, need attention, they must be trimmed clean, 'so that they may yield more fruit'. Superfluous leaves and shoots here and there are absorbing nourishment without adding to the fruitfulness of the vine, they must be nipped off. Thus trimmed, the entire sap and vigour of the vine will be consumed in producing fruit in abundance, and this fruitful abundance of the vine will be the joy and the boast of the husbandman. Applying the image to ourselves, we see that there are, unfortunately, some men who profess to be Christians, yet they fail to produce any of the fruits of the Christian faith; they perform none of the good works of Christian charity which Christ has promised to reward the next life. They are dead branches detracting from the beauty and perfection of the vine, they must be cut off. The determination of their destiny we leave to God. As to the good branches that are trimmed and cleaned, may we not see in them an image of those men and women who strive to regulate their lives according to the consciousness of their Christian dignity, but who are still subject to the infirmities and shortcomings of human nature. God seeks to trim these branches by allowing them to encounter the trials and troubles of life. For one it is illness, for another financial worry, there are the difficulties at home, the difficulties at our work, all providing us with an opportunity to exercise virtue, the virtue of patience, the virtue of trust in God. In a word, cleansed and trimmed by the Divine Husbandman, we are producing the fruits of good works and producing them more abundantly.

Lest the apostles be dismayed at the suggestion of this cleaning, the Master assures them that it has already been commenced in them. "You, through the message I have preached to you, are clean already". The teaching of Jesus has cleansed their hearts of the obstacles to their growth in virtue. If we will but assimilate the doctrine of Christ, we shall have within us a principle that will transform us, that will be a norm for our thoughts, our affections, our actions.

There is a condition, however, upon which depends the fruitfulness of the teaching of Christ, namely, the permanence of the union between Christ and ourselves. "You have only to live on in Me, and I will live on in you. The branch that does not live on in the vine can yield no fruit of itself; no more can you, if you do not live on in Me. I am the vine, you are its branches; if a man lives on in Me, and I in him, then

he will yield abundant fruit; separated from Me, you have no power to do anything. If a man does not live on in Me, he can only be like the branch that is cast off and withers away; such a branch is picked up and thrown into the fire, to burn there". How simple, yet how sublime a rule of life. The lesson of Christ is evident. The trunk of the vine is the channel through which flows the sap that nourishes the branches of the vine. Each individual branch can send forth neither shoot nor bud, nor can it bear leaves, or blossom, or fruit, unless it is joined in living union with the whole vine. Our dependence upon Christ is exactly similar. Unless we are united to Christ, unless we receive from Him, through that union, divine grace and supernatural nourishment, we cannot hope to produce the fruits of good works. The necessity of our union with Him is absolute, "separated from Me, you have no power to do anything". St. Augustine describes these last words as a panegyric of grace, which raises up the courage of the humble, and stops the boasting of the proud.

How, you may ask, are we to achieve this union? By a whole-hearted acceptance of the teaching of Christ. We were united to Him by our Baptism, we will preserve and strengthen that union by the faithful observance of the precepts which He has given us. Our Lord Himself has told us that "if any man loves me he will keep my word". We have the precept to love God and to love our neighbour for the love of God. For the rest there is no more beneficial way of learning how to conform our own lives to the life of Christ, our Divine Model, than by reading the inspired accounts of the life and teaching of Christ which are contained in the Sacred Scriptures.

"As long as you live on in me, and my words live on in you, you will be able to make what request you will, and have it granted". This is one of the blessings of our union with Christ. The prayer of a disciple united with Christ, His Master, will be a reflection of the wishes of Christ; no request will be made that is not entirely submissive to the good pleasure of our Heavenly Father. Jesus has one thing more to add; the crowning glory of our union with Him: "My Father's name has been glorified, if you yield abundant fruit, and prove yourselves My disciples". In remaining united to Christ we realise the purpose of our existence in this world, for the good works which flow from that union glorify God, and for that were we created.

There is no one surely who does not appreciate the dynamic force of these truths. By frequent reflection upon them, let us endeavour

to make them our own. Knowledge of the truth is but the first step, it remains for us to shape our lives in their everyday activities to conform with these truths. We must not hesitate to call upon the Divine assistance to accomplish this work, having always in our minds the firm conviction that by so doing we shall yield abundant fruit and glorify the name of our Heavenly Father.

P. L. MURPHY.

Notes

Although St. Gregory tells us that signs and wonders belong more to the infancy of the Church, yet they are plentiful, too, in our own times. Catholics from all over the world have seen, or at least have read of the extraordinary happenings connected with Therese Neumann. Most of the books written about her have asserted, sometimes enthusiastically, that genuine supernatural events have been taking place. Foremost among such works is that of Archbishop Teodorowicz *Mystical Phenomena in the Life of Therese Neumann*. But there are other voices which are doubtful. Thus in 1940 Dr. B. de Poray-Madeyski wrote *Le cas de la visionnaire stigmatisée Therese Neumann de Konnersreuth*. The book bears the Imprimatur *Ex Vicariatu Urbis*, and in his introduction the author, who is described as a medical expert of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, mentions that it has the approbation of high ecclesiastical authorities. This side of the question has received little attention in English books, but now Miss Hilda Graef, a Catholic living in England, has published *The Case of Therese Neumann* (Cork, 1951, Mercier Press, 12/6) emphasising some unsatisfactory elements in the story of Konnersreuth. Some readers think the book almost impious, others feel that Miss Graef has done the Church a real service. One reviewer is quoted on the jacket as saying: "The book ought to be written, and ought to be reviewed and made known far and wide." Fr. Martindale gave his verdict: "I have never read a more baffling document."

No Catholic, of course, denies the possibility of miracles, even in modern times. Most beatifications and canonisations call for miracles, and they are examined by the Congregation of Rites, and, where they satisfy the tests, are accepted as part of God's Providence. The Church in its official acts has a well-balanced attitude, it is not incredulous, but it is strictly critical. Wonders can and do happen, and if they are genuine they have nothing to fear, and everything to gain from a reverent but searching examination which uses the most efficient and most modern means to discover the truth.

It will be the aim of these notes to give an account of this book. Obviously nothing more than a very brief mention of the most important elements can be given. The book has been severely criticised, and

something will be said of this criticism. Lastly, without trying to give a judgment on the objective truth of Konnersreuth, some practical conclusions will be proposed.

The general conclusion of the book is: "A supernatural origin of the phenomena exhibited by Therese Neumann is not necessarily demanded by the evidence at our disposal, which, admittedly, is not as complete, in many respects, as one might desire." Two points are emphasised to prove the need of "the greatest caution and circumspection." These are, firstly, the presence of "illness certified by the examining doctors as hysterical in nature", and secondly, that the phenomena "do not correspond with similar experiences in the history of the Church's saints". (p. 145).

Therese Neumann's early years were those of an ordinary girl of rather poor family in the village of Konnersreuth, Bavaria. In 1918, at the age of 20, when helping to extinguish a fire, she suffered injuries which left her with pain, vomiting, and a chronic cough. A severe fall aggravated the symptoms. In hospital she seems to have been a difficult patient, not always obedient. Her condition grew steadily worse, and paralysis, temporary dumbness and blindness came on. In 1920, when she applied for an invalid pension, four doctors who examined her certified to a "very grave hysteria with blindness and partial paralysis". (p. 18).

The blindness disappeared suddenly in 1923, and Therese herself attributed the cure to St. Thérèse of Lisieux, though the parish priest Fr. Naber and later writers were not convinced of its being praeternatural. (p. 20). Later, in 1925, on May 17th, the day on which St. Thérèse was canonised, she told of voices which spoke to her from a bright light, and her crippled limbs were much improved. Acute appendicitis seemed to be indicated in November of the same year. The invalid told of a vision of St. Thérèse, of being told to rise, dress and go to the Church to thank God for her cure. She rose at once and was able to go, though the weakness and pains remained. Dr. Poray-Madeyski later, studying the medical reports, thought the diagnosis of appendicitis quite erroneous.

STIGMATIZATION.

In 1926 stigmatization gradually appeared. This seems to have recurred regularly up to the present, and has, of course, attracted very great attention. During all this quarter of a century, generally on Fridays, bleeding occurs from eyes, hands, feet and side. There is an

account given of observations made on Thursday-Friday, March 22nd-23rd, 1928, by Professor Martini, the director of the University Hospital of Bonn, in the presence of ecclesiastical and medical authorities. (pp. 58-68). It is very disturbing. Briefly, Martini testifies to a good deal of obstruction on the part of the parents. He says further: "I have been struck by quite a series of facts which make it my duty to preserve a very critical attitude towards the phenomena" (p. 67). At least on this particular occasion the doctor is not convinced that everything is above suspicion. (p. 65).

An early chapter of our book (pp. 5-11) discusses the problem of stigmatization, depending largely on an issue of *Etudes Carmélitaines*, October, 1936. These *Etudes* are of recognised value, and the citations used by Miss Graef are drawn from St. John of the Cross, St. Francis de Sales, as well as Fr. Garrigou-Lagrange and other modern scholars.

The phenomena of stigmatization, it is shown, may be found in three classes of persons. First, in those already far advanced in sanctity, as in St. Francis of Assisi. It is an effect of the Holy Spirit, and could be attributed either to the sharpened imagination, aided by praeternatural force, penetrating to the exterior, or to a praeternatural agent working from the exterior to the interior. (p. 7).

Again, stigmatization could be charismatic, a "*gratia gratis data*", given by God for a very important purpose regarding the interests of God and the salvation of souls. Even such stigmatization is not to be expected except in a person who is far advanced in holiness and likeness to Christ (p. 7). Fr. Garrigou-Lagrange is cited in support of this assertion.

Thirdly, in modern times the view has been gaining ground that a number of cases of stigmatization can be explained by purely natural causes. Many of the characteristics of the wounds hold good also for hysterical wounds. Waldmann (Professor of Moral Theology at Dillingen and Regensburg) is cited as writing: "The localisation of a wound in the skin, a bleeding or a blood mark in a definite place of the body solely by the power of the imagination is assured" (p. 9). In passing it might be noted that Fr. Poulain's *Graces of Interior Prayer* in the 1950 reprinting, doubts this claim.

Miss Graef then puts forward this position on Therese's stigmatization: 1) On at least one occasion the medical experts were not satisfied that everything was above doubt. 2) Even if the phenomenon really occurs, there are certain indications in the subject (her hysteria, the

stigmata coming in collapse rather than when at prayer, her spiritual state at that time not being much developed), all of which induce the suspicion that the stigmatization could be a natural manifestation of intense hysteria. (pp. 35, 36).

INEDIA.

From the beginning of her illness Therese found it difficult to eat and to retain food. From August, 1926, began her complete abstinence from food (p. 53). She took a little liquid each week till the end of that year. Thenceforward she is stated to take nothing whatever except a spoonful of water when she receives Holy Communion. When this extraordinary abstinence began to attract attention, Bishop von Henle, Ordinary of Regensburg, the diocese to which Konnersreuth belongs, ordered an investigation. This took place from 14th to 28th of July, 1927, not in a hospital as the authorities would have wished, but in Therese's own home. Four trained Franciscan nursing sisters, under the control of a doctor, maintained a close supervision. Their task was not made easier by difficulties put in their way by the family. Therese herself said she had a vision of Our Lord who spoke of the unworthiness of these sisters, criticised their unfavourable opinion of herself and of her spiritual guide, Father Naber. When they expressed sorrow she told them the Saviour had forgiven them.

Therese's weight varied during the fortnight, but at the end was the same as it had been at the beginning. Medical tests showed typical hunger symptoms, though similar tests taken since had not this result. The Episcopal examination however testified that Therese had taken no food or drink during the time of the investigation. When doubts arose in later times as to whether this fast was really continuing, an important statement was issued in the official Gazette for the Diocese of Regensburg. It stated that the bishop of the diocese, the whole Bavarian Episcopate (1932), and the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office (4th August, 1937), had wished to carry out another investigation. Therese had declared herself willing, but her father had so far refused it, or demanded unacceptable conditions. "In this state of affairs the ecclesiastical authorities can take no responsibility for the reality of the alleged inedia and for the character of other extraordinary happenings at Konnersreuth" (p. 60). They therefore forbade further visits to Therese without permission. Things seem to have remained in this condition up to the present. Miss Graef records that she obtained permission, though at Konnersreuth no one demanded to see it.

Miss Graef suggests three possible explanations. The inedia may be a genuine praeternatural effect, by which God's power supports the life and activity of Therese without ordinary natural nourishment. Many of the books written about Konnersreuth adopt this view. Some are perhaps over-enthusiastic. Thus Archbishop Teodorowicz: "And so we stand before the grandiose phenomenon of the perpetual lack of food, which, if solely and alone were proved to be true, would be able to raise the world out of its snares" (p. 58).

Secondly, the fast could be genuine but natural. Fr. Thurston, S.J. (in *The Month*, 1930, II, p. 528 ff.) describes a case where a woman satisfied several doctors that she kept a prolonged and absolute fast. Fr. Thurston's conclusion, which Miss Graef accepts (p. 57) is: "In the presence of the facts just quoted it seems difficult to affirm with confidence that the disinclination for food which we find recurring in the case of almost all visionaries (here follows a list, including Therese), is necessarily of supernatural origin". (*Month*, p. 535). Miss Graef also cites Benedict XIV: "*Colligitur ex dictis, longa jejunia duplicis esse generis, alia videlicet supra naturam, alia intra naturam*".

A third hypothesis, one which will doubtless raise strong protests from the advocates of Therese, ascribes the condition to a "split personality". Perhaps she really at times takes nourishment, yet at other times, with changed personality, in perfectly good faith denies this. It is said to be common in such persons that when in one personality they are quite unaware of what takes place at the times when the other personality is dominant. (p. 56).

Not everyone will agree with Fr. Thurston, and after a careful reading of his article, it seems one could still doubt of his conclusion. Many will refuse to accept the hypothesis of food being taken furtively, even in good faith. But still it does seem prudent to adopt the official position of the Chancellery of the diocese, that until another test is made under scientific guarantees, we can hardly assert that the inedia is a definitive confirmation of supernatural influence.

VOICES AND VISIONS.

From 1925 to the present day Therese claims to have heard many voices and seen many visions. The greater part of these have been concerned with the sufferings of Christ. Again and again she has witnessed the different scenes of the Passion, from the Agony in the Garden step by step to the Crucifixion. This series regularly occurs with the appearance of the stigmata, and with very severe suffering. While most

of her biographers regard these voices and visions as genuine revelations to Therese, Miss Graef notes that others who have examined the evidence see in the reports reason for reserving judgment.

First, these visions do not always agree in detail with the inspired account of the scene given in the Gospel. For example, Therese says (p. 37): "I saw three Apostles (at the Agony in the Garden), but they were not lying down or sleeping, as they are usually pictured, but sat rather, leaning on stones, and were entirely powerless". St. Matthew, however, has (c. 26, v. 40, Rheims Version): "And he cometh to his disciples and findeth them asleep".

Secondly (pp. 38, 39) Therese is not merely a spectator, but has an active part in these scenes, and her part is rather strange. She is there to save Christ from death. She seems really to expect that she will succeed in setting the Divine Victim free, as if during her visionary state she had forgotten that Christ had freely suffered for mankind "even unto death". Rather than being illuminated in the true spirit of Christ, her mind seems to lose sight of the fundamental doctrine of the redemption.

There are surprising remarks made by Therese, as when (p. 41) during her state of exhaustion after a Good Friday trance, she is reported to have said to Our Lord: "Saviour, I have no time for you to talk to you now; I must sleep properly". This is surely irreverent. To a priest reciting his Office she once said: "You cause the Saviour a severe trial by reading Latin to him for an hour"! But perhaps she did not say it seriously.

Further she shows a sympathy with Judas who was permitted to kiss Our Lord, rather than with Peter who by his sword-thrust drew the first blood. This extraordinary preference has spread, and is now at times found among devout souls. It is, of course, quite mistaken.

Lastly, Miss Graef notes (p. 141) in her account of Therese's spiritual life, that although the stigmata and the frequent visions would lead one to expect her to have a particular devotion to the sufferings of Christ, on the contrary, Therese, outside these visions, shows little devotion to the Passion. Archbishop Teodorowicz himself is quoted as saying: "I have made exact inquiry on this point of Therese herself, and asked her various questions, without her knowing my purpose. (The Archbishop was seeking to disprove the theory that her stigmatization is produced by the concentration of the mind on the sufferings of Christ.) The result was that I ascertained she did not have any particu-

lar devotion to the Passion before the stigmatization". And after? The Archbishop continues: "I was much astonished . . . when in answer to my question whether outside the ecstasy she liked to meditate on the sufferings of Christ, she answered that she did not care to meditate on them at all". (p. 141). This is very unusual, and is a point which must receive serious consideration.

If then the available evidence of these extraordinary events does not necessarily demand a supernatural origin, as Miss Graef claims, some other explanation must be possible. That proposed brings us to the question of the influence on Therese of Father Naber, the parish priest of Konnersreuth, and Therese's director from the beginning.

At once let us exclude even the idea that Miss Graef accuses this good priest, who has had a very difficult task for nearly thirty years, of any bad faith. Rather, all agree on his zeal, his devout spirit, his enthusiasm for what he considers a great grace that God is giving the world through his lowly penitent. Miss Graef does suggest that it would have been better if he had not taken the early phenomena as supernatural so easily, if he had moved more slowly and critically, and in the progress of the visions, at which he is often present, if he did not put to Therese leading questions that suggest the answer.

The alternative explanation of the visions can be briefly put thus: Therese, of a hysteric temperament, is susceptible to suggestion, whether by questions or hints, or merely by telepathy. Father Naber earnestly expects a certain vision, Therese becomes aware of this, and sees the vision that was expected. An adequate presentation of the reasons in support of this theory would mean reproducing whole pages of the book. But this can be said: it does not seem impossible, and there are a number of points that it would explain.

OTHER PHENOMENA.

There are other strange phenomena in the life of Therese; she is said to speak phrases of Aramaic, to make prophecies, to know what is happening elsewhere, as well as reading the secrets of men's hearts. Miss Graef treats each of these points, and in each case, either the evidence of the fact is unsatisfactory, it is often at second or third hand, or, where the facts are established, once more, a non-supernatural origin is not necessarily excluded. Thus with regard to clairvoyance, the knowledge of things distant, Miss Graef refers to Fr. Herbert Thursdon, S.J., a recognised authority on such matters, who in an article in *The Month*, December, 1926, describes a number of similar events, and

proposes a natural explanation. Miss Graef could have cited the more recent work of the same author *The Church and Spiritualism* (2nd edition, 1935), which contains long and interesting chapters on Telepathy and Clairvoyance, in both of which he claims we have to do with natural powers of the human mind, about which as yet we know very little.

Miss Graef's book has received a very mixed reception. In the *Sydney Catholic Weekly* of June 21st, 1951, an article written for the American N.C.W.C. by Dr. Max Jordan, is reproduced. This author shows himself very well acquainted, both with the studies involved, and with the literature that has appeared about Therese Neumann. He mentions that about one hundred books have been written concerning her up to the present. In general he disagrees strongly with Miss Graef, and approves rather of the numerous authors who believe that the happenings of Konnersreuth are genuine supernatural manifestations. In a number of instances in this article, Dr. Jordan's enthusiasm for Therese seems to make him unfair to Miss Graef's book.

There are a number of other works which support Miss Graef. One of the latest is from the pen of Fr. Paul Siwek, S.J., an authority on questions of experimental psychology. A reviewer of Miss Graef's book in the *Irish Standard* (March 16th, 1951), anonymous, but describing himself as a member of the Society of Psychic Research, and interested widely in such matters, gives his verdict: "With this modestly-worded statement (that a supernatural origin is not necessarily demanded) no intelligent person will disagree"!

Dr. Max Jordan alludes in his article mentioned above, to an article written in the *Osservatore Romano* of February 4th, 1951, by Mgr. Alfred Ottaviani of the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office (reproduced in *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, April, 1951, under the title of "*True Christianity, Signs and Wonders*"). The article refers to a number of recent occurrences which falsely claimed to be supernatural, and where many of the faithful showed a lamentable disregard for the authority of the Church, preferring to it these "signs and wonders". It states that in these troubled times there is a popular hankering after the wonderful (*I.E.R.*, p. 335) "Revelation ended with the death of the last Apostle, and has been entrusted to the Church, its interpreter and custodian. Nothing else necessary to our salvation can be revealed to us. There is nothing more for which we look. We have everything if we wish to make use of it". True visions "can furnish us with new motives for fervour, but not with new elements of life or doctrine".

One of these incidents referred to by Mgr. Ottaviani took place at Heroldsbach, also in Bavaria in 1949, and an account of it is given in *L'Ami du Clergé*, June 7th, 1951. Some children claimed to have seen Our Lady with the Divine Child, high up in the branches of trees. A diocesan examination was held, and it was established that the apparition was nothing more than a chance formation of branches which, seen from a certain angle, suggested human forms. The clergy was forbidden to attend, the laity dissuaded. Yet crowds of over 30,000 persisted in gathering. Many undesirable things took place there.

Mgr. Ottaviani does not mention in his article the events of Konnersreuth, nor is it here implied that its condemnation is aimed at them. But the spirit which the article describes is surely the spirit in which we should approach all such extraordinary manifestations, a spirit of critical yet reverent reserve. This is the spirit in which the Church proceeds when she examines the lives of holy persons. Popular parlance may call the official who directs the criticism, "The Devil's Advocate", but the Church gives him the honorable title of "Promotor of the Faith".

In the reports which appear on this question we ought distrust particularly personal accounts of untrained eye-witnesses. Even those who have experience in the ordinary direction of souls are liable to error when confronted with these extraordinary cases. The sight of one like Therese in her great sufferings and distress, in the atmosphere of expectancy and wonder, will move most people to pity and sympathy. This does credit to their hearts, but can easily interfere with an objective judgment. An experienced psychiatrist would be in a better position to judge.

If in God's good time Therese Neumann is canonized, if the extraordinary events of her life are accepted by the Church, then all good Catholics will thank God who has done such great things in his saints. In the meantime it is wiser to reserve judgment. Priests, especially when as official teachers they speak from the pulpit, if they propose to the faithful what the Church has not yet approved run a risk of encouraging this natural but undesirable hankering after "signs and wonders". Rather should their attitude be that of the lines of Dante with which Mgr. Ottaviani concludes his article: "You have the Old and the New Testament, and the Shepherd of the Church to guide you. This is sufficient for your salvation". (*Canto V. vv. 73-77*).

JEREMIAH HOGAN, S.J.

Book Reviews

DE SANCTISSIMA TRINITATE (Theologia Biblica), by P. F. Ceuppens, O.P., 2nd Ed., Marietti, Rome, 1950, pp. XI—300.

When reviewing other volumes of Fr. Ceuppens' excellent series on Biblical Theology we paid tribute to the magnificent service he has rendered to Dogmatic Theology by giving us an exact exegesis of the various scriptural texts relating to the Dogmatic tracts. Such is the quality of his work in the field of Biblical Theology that no student of the sacred science should deny himself the wholesome fruits that have resulted from so much research, meditation, and painstaking endeavour.

In this second edition of *De Sanctissima Trinitate*, Fr. Ceuppens has incorporated the Trinitarian doctrine of the Catholic Epistles, and has added many texts from the Pauline Epistles, particularly those whose value has been a matter of dispute. Every point is subjected to rigorous examination according to the strict rules of scientific criticism, and thus the final evaluation of each text is a product of masterful scholarship. Fr. Ceuppens' scientific make-up will not allow him to grasp at every straw that might seem of value in saving some dogmatic truth. In fact, he has plucked many such feeble instruments from the hands of over-optimistic theologians who gave little service to theological science by basing dogmas on scriptural evidence that would barely convince a tyro, and only served to bring ridicule on our schools from the learned without. Whenever he finally shows that a dogmatic truth is contained in a particular passage, such is the weight of evidence brought forward to justify his conclusion that the student is given an apodictic argument to justify his faith.

However, there is one adverse criticism we should like to make. It concerns the learned exegete's approach to his whole study, and rises from his preoccupation of giving a critical estimate of a particular text considered objectively in itself and quite apart from other texts which throw great light on it. When dealing with the Divinity of Christ in the Old Testament, for example, the author shuts out the light of the New Testament, which was meant, of course, to illuminate the shades and tenebrosities of the more obscure revelation. The result is that the author views the ancient revelation with the mentality of a Jew, not of a Christian. He is content to leave Christ very much hidden "in the loins of the Old Dispensation", neglecting to view Him from the vantage-

point that has been reserved for the children of light. In this way a great measure of the richness of God's word is lost; and, although it might help textual criticism, yet it is not the ideal approach of the Catholic mind because it neglects the truth of the homogeneity of God's revelation to man through the course of centuries.

The present volume is arranged very systematically. Firstly, the author considers the Mystery of the Trinity in the Old Testament, treating separately the plurality of Persons in God, and each of the Three Persons individually. He concludes this section with a brief, precise summary of his findings. Secondly, he considers the texts of the New Testament referring to the Blessed Trinity in each and every sacred writer, and following the same order as in the first section. Again his conclusions are concisely summarized. Then follows an index of Biblical quotations, running into many hundreds, used in the work. Finally, there is given an index of some five hundred authors to whose works Ceuppens refers, sometimes very caustically, throughout his 300 pages of a study that deserves the closest attention of all who aspire to a deeper appreciation of the primordial Mystery of our Faith.

T.M.

*

*

*

*

PATROLOGY, by Johannes Quasten, Vol. I, The Beginnings of Patristic Literature. Spectrum Publishers, Utrecht-Brussels, 1950, pp. XVIII-349.

This first volume of Professor Quasten's proposed four volume Patrology will arouse great interest. The author, now for some years at the Catholic University of America, Washington, is already well known for the magnificent series of patristic translations which he is editing under the title *Ancient Christian Writers*. His *Patrology* will be a most valuable introduction and guide to the collection of *Ancient Christian Writers*. Up to this, little original has been attempted in English on patrology in general. Standard books were translations from foreign languages. It is safe to say that Professor Quasten's work will long be the classic work for the English speaking student. A Patrology is a history of patristic writings; it is not meant to be a history of dogma, nor a discussion of the teaching of an early Christian writer. A Patrology tells the main facts of a particular writer's life, gives a list of his works, and directs the reader to the texts of those works, the translations made of them, and the literature, in books and

review articles, that bear on these writings. A model in this field was the *Patrologia* of Steidle, O.S.B.

To the scientific exactitude of Steidle, Quasten brings great, much greater, material, and he develops, as much as possible without going beyond his province, the description of the thought of the writer in question. His first volume begins with the Apostles' Creed and ends with St. Irenaeus. Perhaps to give some idea of the riches in this book, an example may prove more convincing than a mere enumeration of its merits. A good example would be St. Ignatius of Antioch. First of all we have the bare facts of the saint's life (pp. 63-64); next a brief, but clear, account of the theology of St. Ignatius—the main doctrines he touched upon, the Church, the Eucharist, the hierarchy, etc. (pp. 65-73); the authenticity of the epistles, together with the various editions, translations and studies devoted to the letters of St. Ignatius are then given (pp. 73-76). Professor Quasten pays special attention to English translations and what has been written in English on St. Ignatius, in the hundred or more references he gives in his study of St. Ignatius. In other words, this first-class scholar puts the reader in the way of quickly and surely covering all that is of value in the study of the martyr. This painstaking method is adopted with each of these all important writers in the early centuries of Christianity.

It is a book for the student; it is, also, a book of value for those who wish to know something of these ancient witnesses to the faith, who cannot be neglected without great loss. For instance, where can I read St. Justin on the Sunday of Christians of the second century? What do competent men think of his words? From Quasten, such information can be readily gained.

This splendid opening volume contains the mature scholarship of the distinguished German scholar, who has brought lustre to his adopted Catholic University of Washington. The book is well printed and strongly bound. A few misprints have been noticed in this otherwise elegant work.

T.V.

*

*

*

*

ST. AUGUSTINE: AGAINST THE ACADEMICS, translated by John J. O'Meara, The Newman Press, Maryland, pr. 3 dollars, pgs. VI + 212.

St. Augustine's dry little dialogue on the ability of man to know is not likely to have general appeal, but everything possible has been

done to make this translation of it attractive. Like its predecessors in the series of "Ancient Christian Writers," it is handsomely bound, and the print is large and clear. In an introductory section covering thirty pages, a number of questions bearing on the book are briefly treated. There is a short life of the saint up to the time he composed the *Contra Academicos*, and notes on the other persons involved. A longer treatment is given to the book's historicity. Arguments are presented for both sides, and the conclusion offered that, although it has some basis in fact, a great deal has been added for literary effect.

Two other questions discussed in the introduction recur frequently throughout, for much of the notes is given to proving that the *Contra Academicos* does not conflict with the Confessions, and that Porphyry had an influence on St. Augustine's Neo-Platonism even greater than that of Plotinus. These points dominate the notes, though the influence of Cicero's *Academica*, references to the *Retractiones*, and short biographies of philosophers mentioned have a big part. There are also frequent references to books and articles. In all, these notes cover forty-four pages.

The translation itself is simple and clear. No attempt has been made to keep the liveliness of style found in even this early work of the saint, but the English has at least the great virtue that it can be read and understood with ease.

An index is attached. The references are to pages only, which makes it hard to find names or things in the small print of the notes. Addition of the note-number would have helped. However, such a minor fault is more than balanced by the completeness shown in listing subjects.

B.J.

* * * *

THE BREAKING OF BREAD. John Coventry, S.J. Pp. 190. Sheed and Ward, 10/6.

The most obvious attraction of this book is the collection of five dozen and more photographs of the Mass. The photo on the dust cover will seem strange, however, until the caption inside is seen. A pity, too, that the minor elevation is not shown. Otherwise these large, clear, and artistic pictures are quite a triumph of printing. They accompany the explanation of the Mass' prayers in Ch. 5, which constitutes cycle three of the book.

After an introduction discussing ritual, sacrifice (in general and at

Mass), there follow three cycles of text, each covering the whole Mass. The first sketches the outline of the action, the second describes the actual structure (a chapter each to the Mass of the catechumens and that of the faithful), while the third gives a detailed examination of the prayers and actions. Some matters are unavoidably treated a couple of times, but generally to the reader's advantage. The only place where it is hard to make a clear synthesis is in the double treatment of the *Fractio*. The difficulty is no doubt intrinsic, namely to be quite sure of what varied elements the *Fractio* is the relic. The advantage of the cyclic treatment is that you get the whole thing clearly in your mind's eye three times, seeing deeper each time. It would be hard on the mental digestive system if everything in the Mass had been dealt with exhaustively in the ordinary consecutive manner. Patterns and unities would not have been so clear.

Condensation and lack of active participation tend to obscure the recurrence of a definite pattern in many of the rites, but Fr. Coventry shows how the procession-chant-prayer pattern occurs three times. He also shows the unity of the Canon (beginning with the Preface) in an interesting fashion. He points out that the phrase, "*Per Christum Dominum Nostrum*", which in the Preface proclaims the unique dignity of our worship, is repeated throughout the Canon, not as the usual conclusion to a number of separated prayers, but as the triumphant theme of one majestic prayer, finding its full elaboration in the thought-packed conclusion. He dwells, too, on the internal unity of this conclusion, the liturgical climax of the Mass, showing how it has been somewhat broken up by the additions made over the centuries.

Many interesting explanations are offered of small actions and prayers. The linking of the Offertory *Dominus Vobiscum* with the Secret prayer, the remark that the various doxologies express a fact not a wish, the nuance of meaning suggested for the signs of the cross over the oblata (a repeated, loving indication of the Gifts being made to God), these are some examples and helpful interpretations.

The only omission that seems regrettable and unnecessary to the reviewer is some account of the meaning of the altar as standing for Christ Himself, which would have come in quite easily and with profit when the *Oramus te Domine* and *Supplices te rogamus* are being explained.

This book should be of great assistance to priests in deepening their own and other's appreciation of and participation in the Mass.

P.L.

THE SAINTS IN PICTURES: SS. Anthony of Egypt, Jerome, Francis, Catherine of Siena. By Maisie Ward. Sheed and Ward. 40 pp. in each volume.

In neat binding and attractive dust covers we have been given the first four books of a series which is to comprise eight in all—at least, there are four more small volumes in preparation. Let us hope there will be more than eight, for they are valuable from any point of view: spiritual, literary, artistic, historical. A publisher's note tells us that the series is a "tribute to the strength and beauty of sincerity". It is a claim well-sustained. We have found them charming, in the illustrations (eight monochromes and four colour plates), as well as in the scholarly but lightly written biographical sketches.

Speaking of St. Anthony and the Desert Fathers, the author finely sets out the conviction: "The hermits in the desert stand at the threshold of the Church's story as Nazareth at the threshold of the human life of Our Lord. And after the peace of Nazareth He, too, before beginning His preaching and His teaching, went forth into the desert to be tempted by the devil".

With the life of St. Jerome we pass to a different level. He was an intellectual genius, and the world still feels the impact of his thought and learning. His stormy life seems to have influenced the artists, who even hundreds of years after his death departed not from the tradition that Jerome could not possibly have been revered by his feminine pupils and disciples. Only a lion could live with one so *farouche*. So we have the lion in every picture, but a lion looking at him with such grateful and tender astonishment that a worse companion could easily be found. So great was the opposition Jerome aroused in his day that he would say in moments of discouragement that no one would attack him if he just made baskets. Many an apostle with ideas, even in our own day, could say the same, and be wryly consoled.

As materialism has invaded so deeply the territory of even apparently religious people, there has been a flight from joy. Our needs have grown with our desires, and our discontent with both. It is to such a generation of unhappy people—unhappy in the midst of plenty—that St. Francis of Assisi has a special message. Maisie Ward gives us the legends—we do not seem able to have St. Francis without them. Yet they are the slightest aspect of his life. The pictures in this volume are particularly good, whether by Giotto, Bellini, Lippi, or others less well known.

Writing of St. Catherine of Siena the author makes the point that it was because the Middle Ages were responsive to sanctity that this saint became a figure in European history. Yet—such are the paradoxical ways of Divine Providence—Catherine died amid the wreck of all she had striven for. It is admirable to see how much history can be fitted—and so clearly sketched—in such a small volume as this under review. The artists of the following centuries—the 14th and 15th—(she died in 1380) returned again and again to the thought of the delicate young woman, living an intensely supernatural life, yet able to stand before Cardinals and rebuke them, and to bring back to Rome the Papacy after its seventy-year stay in Avignon.

M.O.

*

*

*

*

APOLOGETICS FOR THE PULPIT. By Rev. Aloysius Roche. Burns, Oates and Washbourne, London, 1950. Pp. 771. 22/6.

The appearance of this new work in the field of Apologetics might bring the retort from Australian priests, who, it seems, are all ardent advocates of Archbishop Sheehan's "Apologetics" that it is trespassing on sacred ground. Be that as it may, it is, nevertheless, refreshing and encouraging that an attempt to popularize, if we may use the term, the Science of Apologetics, has appeared. For the closet has been opened, and the skeleton, the cold bare facts of Sheehan's accepted work, has been presented to us clothed with a new life—and who among us does not yearn that we could make our Apologetics live, especially from the pulpit—alive with an abundance of illustrations, pertinent well chosen sayings of the old philosophers, not to mention the effective quotations from men of authority as the inimitable Cardinal Newman and, of course, the ever influential papal encyclicals. This is the attractive feature of the work.

This book is a reprinting in an omnibus edition of 3 volumes which appeared shortly before the recent war—in all, 771 pages, divided into three sections, each containing 40 specimen lectures. The first, treating of the grounds of religious and christian belief, begins with the existence of God and ends with the Resurrection. The second covers the divine origin and organic structure of the Church, her struggle to maintain the integrity of her teaching and her impacts on human society. The third section is given over to the Sacraments, the Sacramentals and Devotions. The chapter headings are exhaustive; the subject matter is,

perhaps, a little stinted but, nevertheless, sufficient and original thoughts are offered for the preacher's simple development. The aim of the author, "to bring all the essential matter under the eye in a popular, rather than a scholastic form, to lighten the whole by a copious use of illustration, and to pay special attention to beginnings and endings", has certainly been attained. In this way it would seem to supplement in an admirable manner the scholastic form of Archbishop Sheehan's work.

Father Aloysius Roche, Parish Priest of Billericay, in England, has now penned, all to his credit, quite a few volumes on various subjects appertaining to his faith; although his fame as a writer may never rival that of Newman or Wiseman, nevertheless, he has wielded his pen well and to effect; thus showing that this instrument is still capable of doing, if not mighty deeds, then, undoubtedly, most useful ones.

In all, a welcome addition to this much neglected field of study, a useful supplement for any priest's library to which recourse in moments of haste will not be moments of waste.

P.P.

*

*

*

*

IN THE SERVICE OF YOUTH (St. Jeanne de Lestonnac), by Paula Hoesl. Translated from the French by John Carr, C.S.S.R. Sands. 224 pages.

This is an unusual biography, for it is of a saint who was a happy wife, mother, widow—then, Foundress of an Order of Nuns known as the Religious of Notre Dame. Their flourishing schools are to be found in France, Spain, America, Holland, Belgium, England, the Argentine, Mexico, Chili. Each house still seems to be autonomous, owing obedience only to the Superior and to the Bishop of the diocese. In this their foundress followed the tradition of the Ursulines of those days. They, too, were conducting schools for girls in France in the 17th century. At the same time the saintly, if revolutionary, Mary Ward was walking forth and back across Europe between the Channel and Rome, trying in vain (as it seemed then) to obtain papal approval of an institute with non-enclosure and central government.

She never met Jeanne, who spent all her life in France—and what a life! Readers with literary tastes will be glad to meet old Michel Montaigne as a loving uncle. She loved him, too, and, small wonder, for it was he who, touched by her loneliness and uneasy conscience,

removed her from the Calvinist household where her mother had placed her. He saved little Jeanne's faith, thus deserving a prayer from all Notre Dame nuns. Of all her crosses (and they accumulated throughout her life) none was more grievous than her mother's abandonment of the Catholic Faith. The mother died a Calvinist; and Jeanne, then a middle-aged nun and Foundress of an Order, wept afresh, for the minute hardly believing that God could have let it be thus after all her prayers for that clever and loved mother.

The Baroness de Lestonnac was fifty years old when, in 1605, as a widow with several children—all settled in life—she became a nun as the first Religious and Founder of the Religious of Notre Dame. It was to be the Company of Mary—counterpart of the Society of Jesus who had undertaken the work of educating boys in France. It was two Jesuit Fathers who helped her—indeed she undertook the work of founding her institute at their suggestion. They felt the need of nuns to educate the sisters of their boys. It sounded very simple, but in 1605 Jeanne de Lestonnac entered on a course of labour and humiliations that ended only with her death in 1640. By then her institute was well established.

As in the life of every saintly Foundress, there are in her life patches of such humiliating suffering that we can read them only in the light of scriptural teaching about losing one's life to save it. By any other light they are a display of human stupidity and wordliness on the part of the saint's persecutors. God seems to need these creatures who strut their little day. They would be forgotten altogether were it not that biographers use them as a testimony.

M.O.

*

*

*

*

FOUR YEARS' STRUGGLE OF THE CHURCH IN HUNGARY.

Facts and Evidence Published by Order of Josef, Cardinal Mindszenty. Pp. 206. Longmans, 1949. Australian retail price, 10/-.

The complete history of the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty is still, and will perhaps remain, obscure; what is abundantly clear, however, is that the Cardinal, his personality shattered probably by torture and drugs, was prevented from making then his full defence. Fortunately, the Cardinal had foreseen that inevitable hour. A short time before he had sent a number of important documents out of Hungary with instructions that they were to be published in foreign countries in the

event of his arrest. A selection of these was published, therefore, in German. In *Four Years' Struggle of the Church in Hungary* Messrs. Longmans present this selection in an English translation. They vouch for its authenticity by declaring that they have checked the accuracy of their translation by careful reference to the original documents. To a large extent, therefore, this book can be described as the defence of Cardinal Mindszenty—perhaps also as his testament.

It comprises Pastoral Letters, declarations to the press, occasional letters to the Government, and so on. We find the Cardinal exhorting the faithful, protesting against the seizure of the Church schools, the oppression of minorities, and other large-scale crimes that are a common feature of Communist rule. Much of the book is naturally taken up with the refutation of numerous calumnies, so numerous indeed that the Cardinal remarks: "Such a systematic and purposeful propaganda of lies, time and time again disproved, but time and time again repeated, has never been organised against the seventy-eight predecessors in my office". From 1945 to 1948 Cardinal Mindszenty fought with all his strength to defend his flock and country, and the portrait that gradually forms in the mind of the reader is that of a great patriot and a great Bishop. In the last lines of the text are contained his last message as a free man; their warning must never be neglected in any discussion of his trial:

"Should anyone hear or read that I have made a confession or resigned, even if there were evidence proved by my own signature, this must be regarded as a sign of human weakness and frailty, and I declare it herewith null and void".

His feelings as the time of his Calvary approached are given in greater detail in his Advent message to his priests, issued within a month of his arrest. It is a fervent appeal to them to despise the terrors of the persecution, to find, like the Apostles, their joy in suffering for Christ, trusting to God for the ultimate victory.

As a source from which to defend the Cardinal and the Church in Hungary from charges that are still being industriously circulated, this is a useful and timely book. Its value is enhanced by an index, numeration of evidence, and a brief discussion of the implications of the case by Mr. Christopher Hollis, M.P. Students of the pattern of Red persecution will find therein much matter for reflection.

Where necessary, the documents are introduced by notes, explaining their significance and context, and, as a result, the book forms as

well the exciting story of a battle for the soul of a nation, a battle that is still being waged, and which is likely to be repeated elsewhere.

J.B.

*

*

*

*

ST. PETER DAMIAN: HIS TEACHING ON SPIRITUAL LIFE, by O. J. Blum, O.F.M. The Catholic University of America (Studies in Mediaeval History, New Series, Volume X). Washington, 1947, pp. 224.

Father Blum has written an excellent dissertation on the spiritual teaching of St. Peter Damian (1007-1072). It is curious that this great figure has attracted little attention from writers in English. In the deplorable period of 10th and 11th centuries, his great voice and example were there to proclaim that holiness would not pass away from the wicked world, as the Church appeared to sink beneath the waves, before men's eyes, as Gregory VII said. The first part of this book tells, in a brief manner, of the *curriculum vitae* of Damian, his sad boyhood, the monastic vocation, Fonte Avellana, the great work of the Cardinal Bishop of Ostia. Stained with simony and vice, the unhappy clergy heard the passionate plea of Damian, leading them to repentance and purity. Father Blum then gives a careful account of the writings of the saint (pp. 37-70) which were very extensive. The third part of the book is devoted to a painstaking analysis of the saint's teaching on the spiritual life grouped under the headings of the spiritual foundation, the life of penance, the life of virtue and perfection in the world. Peter Damian was the great preacher and moralist of the century, condemning the simony and immorality of the degraded clergy in a way that is sometimes almost brutal. Father Blum's book is not easy to read, but it contains valuable matter, presented in a competent fashion.

T.V.

*

*

*

*

THE NAZARINE. Ailbe J. Luddy, O. Cist. Dublin: Gill, 1951, 10/6.

This book is an attempt to present vividly the impact made by the events of the public life of Christ on the minds of contemporary pagans who had the opportunity of knowledge and contact. The book is in the form of letters, ostensibly written by a Roman sister and brother who had come to Palestine about the time of the commencement of the public life. The presentation is vivid and interesting, and the whole

book very readable; but it may be questioned whether all or many will agree with some of the character interpretations that are introduced, especially with those of Peter and Martha. However, that will be a matter for the reader to decide.

There are some astonishing adaptations made by the writer. The scene at Bethany, beyond the Jordan, where, as is recounted in the first chapter of John, the first disciples met Our Lord, and where they went "and abode with him that day" (v. 39), is violently transposed to some place sufficiently near to Nazareth to allow the party to be received by Our Lady in the house there. The author, in his foreword, rather naively says: "I have taken for granted several points that are open to controversy; for instance, that the house to which Jesus invited Andrew and John was His Mother's home at Nazareth—to which I was moved by the wish to bring Our Blessed Lady into the news at the earliest possible moment". The motive of the author was beyond criticism; but has he not brought her in earlier than the earliest possible moment?

With more forgivable ingenuity, the brother and sister are presented as near relatives and guests of the Centurion at Capernaum, and further dexterity has woven a connection also with the family at Bethany and the Good Thief.

The fiction can hardly be classed as subtle; but, presumably, the chief aim of the book has been accomplished, that is, it makes the reader take a real and living attitude towards those wonderful and divine events which are the only important events in history. Any attempt to make them living is worthy of praise.

J.S.K.

*

*

*

*

STORM OF GLORY, by John Beevers. (Sheed & Ward: 230 pages).

St. Thérèse has been well served by this latest biography for which the author has chosen as title words addressed by Pope XI to French pilgrims on May 18, 1925, the day after her canonization. She has been more effusively, but less well, served by many other admirers; and there are some of us who remember our early years of impatience when faced with the gushing enthusiasm of devotees of the "Little Flower". Some of us may even have disconsolately wondered if our faces were the right shape for sanctity, as more and more ethereal became the features on the sugary little holy pictures. (Still, we stop short of Father Martin-

dale's petulance when confronted with *la synthèse*. Our author mentions this in Appendix I.).

There may be some readers of this biography who will catch a glimpse for the first time of Carmelite life as it really was in Lisieux at the end of the 19th century, under the tyrannical rule of Mother Marie de Gonzague. What a prioress, with her moods, her sponging relatives—and the cat (in need of a few lessons from Puss in Boots)! Yet it was that repulsive milieu that God chose for the formation of St Thérèse. Down the ages no one would be able to say: "It was easy for St. Thérèse in holy Carmel". No, that excuse is ruled out. But since idealistic little Thérèse stayed on and endured, the only thing for her to do was to go straight to God beyond all her disillusionment—to live in the world of divine love and thus to become a saint. Our author says with good sense that once we feel and comprehend "the inexhaustible patience and iron heroism of St. Thérèse... the title, Little Flower, can only be used ironically".

Her biographer has set forth the salient marks of her sanctity, showing how she linked up peace, love and suffering. It is good to remember her words: "Do not think we can find love without suffering". We are told interesting facts about the growth of her devotion to the mystery of the suffering and despised Face of Christ. Pauline's words are: "However tender her devotion to the Child Jesus, it could not be compared to that which she had for the Holy Face". How often can we say over to ourselves the saint's words: "The only thing that can be called love is the complete sacrifice of oneself". Her biographer is right in summing up her life as a complete and joyous renunciation.

In the last section of the book, the author examines her message to mankind. This message is for our particular age distinguished as it is by pride and hatred, for Thérèse is very specially the saint of humility and love. Her fame to-day is just because of her perfection in those two virtues. Then there is her message for the little, insignificant men of what the author calls "our iron age". He explains: "As persons, our importance shrinks from day to day. For most of us our years are spent in doing jobs which, if we do not detest them, are at the best merely means of earning food and shelter". For people on that treadmill, there is not only deliverance, but the path to glory, along the little way of St. Thérèse. In fact it is the only way to wrest peace and happiness from the conditions of modern life. How many obscure souls must it not already have clothed with sanctity. Then beyond this

message to our age, is her permanent, ageless message: Return to the Gospels. Meditate again and again on Our Lord's words and example. Hear again the divine and eternal Truth: *Unless you become as little children, you shall not enter the kingdom of Heaven.* It sums up everything we need on our way to God: poverty of spirit, simplicity and child-like confidence.

M.O.

*

*

*

*

FAITH SEEKS UNDERSTANDING, by John Coventry, S.J., London, Sheed and Ward, pgs. 117, pr. 7/6.

The combination of "faith" and "understanding" makes us think immediately of popular apologetics, but this comes only from habit. The title above is certainly apt, yet it introduces a work which is quite unusual. It is concerned, not with proving that faith is reasonable, but to show how it is reasonable. The author wishes to help both believer and unbeliever to understand the nature of faith. For this end the method of the apologist—from the historicity of the gospels, etc.—is of no value. It merely shows the existence of a reasonableness already there but is not its ground. Such a ground must be intrinsic to faith.

On the second chapter it is shown to have a double source. God has given us a messenger who is also a message. This is Christ, as known personally by the apostles and as living on for us in His church. He has all the signs necessary to show His divine origin, but we need a special insight to recognise them. When grace elevates our minds we believe, for the very act of recognising the dignity of the messenger is to believe the message which He is.

After an outline of this, the main point, various qualities of faith are treated separately. These chapters occupy over half the book and serve both to elaborate and clarify the chief idea. Many interesting problems are mentioned, though lack of space prevents a detailed treatment. However, as it is a book for untrained readers, a more concrete study of the object of faith would have helped understanding without destroying the balance of the work. Apart from one or two short examples, this problem is met only by the formula "Christ living in His Church".

Luckily Fr. Coventry has a pleasing style and the ability to state ideas clearly. He is dealing with difficult matter and some few parts,

despite his clearness, require careful reading and much thought. But on the whole it is an exhilarating little book, particularly useful for any layman wishing a better grasp of his faith.

B.J.

*

*

*

*

COLLECTED LETTERS OF ST. THERESE OF LISIEUX,

edited by the Abbé Combes, translated by F. J. Sheed, with a foreword by Father Vernon Johnson. 390 pages. Sheed & Ward.

Before any discussion of these letters there is one question to be asked and answered: Are they a good introduction to a study of the saint? The answer is, No. Only people who have read and enjoyed her Autobiography will appreciate her letters *en masse*, for it is only such people who will have patience with a good deal of girlish exuberance which she did not shed just because she became a Carmelite. Readers who do not know her worth might be put off by the very early letters. And what a loss that would be for them. So, first give them the Autobiography or any good life of St. Thérèse. Many of the letters are trivial little notes scribbled in haste to her sisters. It will surprise some of her admirers to find how often she refers to herself as a "little grain of sand." The implications of that phrase go deeply into the doctrine of St. John of the Cross; deeply, too, into the whole teaching of Our Lord in the Gospels. In this she is an inspiring guide for all those who realise that the only way of rescuing one's life from the doldrums of monotony is to live it as an adventure in the ways of Divine Love.

From the day of her entrance into Carmel we can trace her supernatural development as we read over her letters. A hint of what is going to be an anguish to her is found in an early letter to Pauline. Thérèse, in retreat before her Clothing, writes: "Silence does good to the soul. But, creatures!... *Creatures!*... Those who surround me are good, of course, but there is a touch of something in them that repels me...." These were the nuns with whom she had to spend her life. At the end they were to testify to her sisterly sweetness to all of them—without exception. Heroism is the name for that. It was good of dear Pauline to share that letter with us.

Readers of the Autobiography will remember how the tragic illness of her father was the sorrow that shadowed most of the years

of her life in Carmel. It was a suffering that moulded her soul to a fineness where the Will of God was her nourishment. Thérèse was only sixteen when she wrote to Céline of their loved father's illness: "What is beginning is martyrdom: let us enter the arena together." The accuracy with which she analysed her own character was mature beyond her years, for at the same stage she wrote to a former class mistress: "If God let me have the bare shadow of happiness, I should cling to it with all the energy, all the strength of my heart."

When the fires of illness are added as a further purification, the tender, sisterly letters continue. No childish exuberance now, but tides of joy flowing deeply. God's masterpiece is almost completed. And in the saint's letters we are privileged to witness, even at this distance, the miracle of Divine grace. How else describe a mortal, sanctified?

M.O.